

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



THE STORY
OF THE
SCOTTISH REFORMATION

A. WILMOT



THE STORY
OF THE
SCOTTISH REFORMATION

BY
A. WILMOT, F.R.G.S

LONDON :
BURNS & OATES, 28, ORCHARD STREET.
—
1883.

NOV 16 1954

*(The rights of translation and of reproduction are
reserved.)*



CONTENTS.

—o—

CHAPTER I.

	PAGE
The great Catholic Reformation in Scotland.—Unreasonable nonsense urged against Catholicism.—Malcolm and Margaret.—A real reformation.—S. Margaret and her successors.—Effects on morality, education and the arts.—Scotland prosperous and great.—True patriotism and Catholicism always together.—True causes of the Protestant Reformation.—Effects of Protestantism disastrous to Scotland	1

CHAPTER II.

Scottish Reformation the work of an Oligarchy.— x Precise causes of this Reformation.—Establishment of the College of Justice.—James V.—The infant Mary and the Regency.—Conspiracy for the murder of Cardinal Beaton.—George Wishart.—Murder of the Cardinal	19
--	----

CHAPTER III.

PAGE.

Events following the death of Cardinal Beaton.—His character.—John Knox approves of his murder.—Proceedings of the murderers; their crimes and debaucheries.—France under Strozzi captures the fortress of S. Andrew's.—League of the reforming nobles with Henry VIII.—War with England.—Battle of Pinkie.—Treason and war.—Rule of the Queen Regent.—Knox writes up “No Fopery,” and then runs away to Geneva.—Invited back.—His cowardice.—Progress of revolt.—At last it is safe for Knox to return.—Life and character of John Knox 42

CHAPTER IV.

Knox leads the plundering crusade against the Churches.—Robberies, violence, and destruction by the Reformers.—New covenant.—The Queen Regent's exertions.—Their failure.—Triumph of the Lords of the Reformation.—Treasonable and seditious proceedings.—Death of the Queen Regent.—Persecution of Catholicism.—Book of Discipline and Confession of Faith.—Death of Francis, husband of Mary.—The Queen invited to come across from France.—Elizabeth refuses a passport.—Mary's reply.—Mary arrives in Scotland 61

CHAPTER V.

Mary arrives in Scotland.—Her persecution for Catholicism commences.—Insolence of Knox.—Disappointment of the Ministers in not getting their share of plunder.—Violence of Knox.—Mary's conduct towards Elizabeth and the Reformers.—

CHAPTER V.—*Continued.*

PAGE.

Persecution of Catholics.—Moray in supreme power.—Mary's conduct as a Catholic Queen.—Her mistakes.—“The end justifies the means,” the motto of the Reformers.—Murder of Rizzio.—Knox one of the assassins.—Conduct of the Queen 79

CHAPTER VI.

Darnley becomes a traitor to his assassin colleagues.—Reconciliation with the Queen.—The Lords determine to kill Darnley.—Murder of Darnley.—Mistaken conduct of the Queen in respect to the Reforming Lords.—Opportunities of assenting to the rights of the Church.—Bothwell rules the State.—His mock trial and acquittal.—He seizes and marries the Queen.—The Church Revenue.—Causes of the Reformation.—Misfortunes of Mary.—Mary charged with Darnley's murder.—Her abdication.—Moray Regent.—His character 99

CHAPTER VII.

Moray's rule.—Sham prosecution of Darnley's murderers.—Meeting of Parliament.—Gross hypocrisy of Lethington.—The casket letters.—Mary escapes from Lochleven.—Assembles her forces.—Is defeated by Moray at Langside.—Escapes to England.—Throws herself on the protection of Elizabeth.—Trial of Mary.—Her acquittal by Elizabeth.—Her captivity.—Moray's conduct.—John Knox again.—Moray assassinated.—Morton becomes Regent.—Knox prophesies.—His cowardly malignity.—Frightful condition of Scotland.—Earl Mar poisoned.—Morton Regent.—Death of Knox.—His character 123

CHAPTER VIII.

PAGE.

Regency of Morton.—Murder condoned by the Government of the Gospel.—Morton's avarice.—Elizabeth's parsimony saves Mary.—Disaffection against Morton.—His capture, trial, and execution.—Excellent conduct of Mary in captivity.—Her fortitude and patience.—The casket letters.—Proofs of their falsity.—Trial of Mary.—Condemnation.—Elizabeth endeavours to kill Mary secretly and fails.—Execution of Mary Queen of Scots.—Lies of Elizabeth.—Effect of Mary's death 145

CHAPTR IX. ✕

Melancholy effects of the Reformation.—No liberty.—The arts and education neglected.—No progress.—Harsh and intolerant laws.—Persecution of witches and Papists.—Cruelty of the Ministers.—Presbyterians *versus* Episcopalians.—Persecution of Catholics.—Dreadful state of the country.—Vice and immorality prevalent.—The Catholic proto-martyr.—The Archbishop of S. Andrews.—Mary and John Ogilvie.—Jesuit priests and Catholic martyrs.—Execution of Ogilvie.—The Kirk essentially persecuting.—An enemy to progress both mental and material.—Catholic missionaries.—Life of Father Archangel.—Inveterate and persistent persecution.—A literature of the dark ages of Presbyterian persecution wanted.—Phœnix-like the Scottish Hierarchy rises from its ashes. 168

HISTORY OF THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION.

CHAPTER I.

The great Catholic Reformation in Scotland.—Unreasonable nonsense urged against Catholicism.—Malcolm and Margaret.—A real reformation.—S. Margaret and her successors.—Effects on Morality, Education, and the Arts.—Scotland prosperous and great.—True patriotism and Catholicism always together.—True causes of the Protestant Reformation.—Effects of Protestantism disastrous to Scotland.

A GREAT reformation in Scotland was effected when such men as *Nillian* Kentigern and Columba taught the truths of the Catholic religion. These Apostles of Scotland were Priests who said Mass daily and believed firmly in the Real Presence, yet we do not find even the most prejudiced Protestant writers denouncing their religion as idolatry. The unreasoning hatred against the doctrines of Catholicism which has so disfigured the theological literature of Scotland appears to set up boundaries as extraordinary as they are illogical. The dogmas believed in by Columba and Kentigern, Queen Margaret, David II., William Wallace, and Robert Bruce are not

alluded to as possessing any influence on these representative people or on the periods in which they lived. The Catholic Church by its Missionaries converted a Pagan people to Christianity, secured good laws, and erected noble temples for the worship of God. It animated the pure patriotism of its greatest soldiers, and consoled the death beds of men whose names alone are monumental. This is the Church of which the Vicar of Christ is the visible head on earth, the Church which honours the Blessed Virgin Mary as the Mother of God, and which daily in every land offers the clean oblation of the Mass.

No student of Scottish history can fail to be struck with the astounding prejudices and extraordinary misstatements which have been used to attack and defame this Church in Scotland—not during the period of many hundred years from S. Kentigern to S. Margaret, or from S. Margaret to William Wallace—but for the short time immediately preceding the reign of James VI. Yet the doctrines were exactly the same during all these periods. An endeavour has been made quite as absurdly to show that the doctrine of the Catholic Church hinged entirely on the character of the lives of many ecclesiastics who, in opposition to its teaching, lived irregular lives. But the unreasonable nonsense of arguing against the doctrine of the Catholic Church because of immoralities committed by her members contrary to her express teaching is so evident as to require no comment.

Nevertheless, on what is the cause of the Reformation based but on two distinct falsehoods?

First: The gates of Hell had prevailed against the Catholic Church, her doctrines having become corrupt. *Historically false. Theologically impossible as contradicting the express promise of Our Saviour.*

Second: The corrupt lives of ecclesiastics required a reformation in the Church. *Yes, a reformation of abuses effected by the Council of Trent. But it was as logical to oppose the fundamental doctrines of the Catholic Church because of these abuses as for a noble cathedral to be razed to the ground in order to destroy the cobwebs and dust which had gathered around its pillars.*

Previous to relating the principal events of what is styled the Protestant Reformation in Scotland, let us glance for a moment at the history of a real reformation of morals comprised in the history of Scotland during the reigns of Queen Margaret and her son. In this way the true principles of the Catholic Church applied to reform, and the true principles of Protestantism applied ostensibly to the same purpose, can be seen contrasted. Here are two instructive pictures eminently deserving attention.

The marriage of Malcolm and Margaret,* King and Queen of Scotland, was celebrated by the

* The chief authority on the life of S. Margaret is her famous Biography, by Turgot, her confessor, which has fortunately been preserved.

Bishop of S. Andrew's at Dunfermline in the year 1070. The people of Scotland were then only beginning to emerge from barbarism. The refinements of civilization were comparatively unknown, and religion was the great means successfully infused to elevate the people. In the position of Queen, observed by all, Margaret taught by an example as brilliant as it was efficacious. Her whole life was actuated by the principles of Catholicism, and was one great work of piety and charity. Her pure soul took no delight but in the incomparable charms of divine love. Assiduous prayer and meditation so far, however, from taking her from the duties of her state in life, only rendered her more capable of performing them. Her husband sincerely loved her, and she was always to him a tender, true, and loving wife. To her subjects she was most bountiful, and wherever she went multitudes of the poor crowded, and never went away unrelieved. But for their spiritual wants she was as solicitous as for their temporal. By her advice holy and zealous Bishops and pastors were provided. Among other reforms a complete and much needed change was effected in regard to the observance of the Lord's Day and the reception of the Sacraments. Mass was heard on Sundays, and this special day set apart as one for rest and sanctification, while every effort was made to induce the people to approach the Sacraments regularly and worthily. In fact, a reformation was wanted and a reformation was effected. Every

tree is known by its fruit, and a true reformation should increase charity and peace while it strengthens legitimate authority. Malcolm was a man of ability and energy, who thoroughly appreciated the great virtues of his wife, and benefited both by her example and advice. His own family in particular and the nation in general felt the beneficent effects of a reformation in morals and in discipline.

Margaret most carefully attended to the education of her children, and frequently, when instructed in her presence in the doctrines of the Catholic Church, she would say to them, "Oh, my children, fear the Lord, for they that fear Him shall want no manner of thing that is good. And if you love Him, He will give you prosperity in this life and eternal happiness with all His saints in that which is to come." As to the family so to the nation. Malcolm and Margaret improved the manners and morals of the nation by encouraging education on the soundest basis. A great revolution was successfully commenced which can be traced through subsequent reigns. The language and laws were altered and improved, learning was encouraged, religion nobly endowed, and the poor amply provided for. Margaret is the source from which flowed the civilization and improvements whose noble monuments still speak in praise of her reformation, and in denunciation of that of John Knox. The remains of the Abbeys, Melrose, Holyrood and Jedburgh, still raise their beautiful

arching arms to Heaven as witnesses in favour of the favourable influences of Catholicism upon art and refinement. Construction was the work of one reformation, destruction of the other, and it may be truly said that while the Catholic Church effected reformation, John Knox and his followers caused the deformation of both religion and its temples throughout Scotland.

In order to show the effects of a thoroughly Catholic reformation, animated by the spirit of Catholicism, and directed by its firm supporters, it is only necessary to refer to the pages of Protestant writers. These men testify to the true character of the Catholic Church, so calumniated by John Knox and his followers, while they conclusively prove that the leaders of the Reformation had really no case when they declared against the dogmas, teaching, and influence of the Church of S. Margaret, David II., William Wallace, and Robert Bruce. Spotteswood tells us, “Never was there more lamentation made for the death of two Princes than was for Margaret and her husband Malcolm. To speak of Malcolm’s piety, justice, and magnanimity he outwent in all these the Princes of his time. His Queen, Margaret, was in her place no less famous in all the virtues which become women. She was devout towards God, charitable to the poor, and exceedingly liberal in the advancing of public works.” Buchanan tells us that “Malcolm turned his pains and industry with great success towards the reformation of the

public manners." Lord Hailes says that, "Although Malcolm was the ruler of a nation uncivilised and destitute of foreign resources, yet for twenty-seven years he supported an unequal contest with England, sometimes with success, never without honour." It is most noteworthy that Catholicism and patriotism went hand in hand. Traitors to their religion were generally traitors to their country. All the principal leaders of the Reformation were bribed agents of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, for the sacrifice of that independence in the cause of which Malcolm, Wallace, Bruce, and a long list of noble Scottish patriots had fought and suffered.

This subject is merely adverted to now, but in due course it will be proved that the traitors in Scotland who calumniated the Catholic religion and rebelled against it on the specious plea of reforming it were also traitors to their country and calumniators of their lawful sovereign. Mr. Cosmo Innes* refers to the enlightened monarch David I. leading the Burghers of Scotland forward, and protecting their industry by laws and charters: "Towns where Bishops fixed their Sees became the centres of learning, religion, and civilization over wide and barbarous districts. Then came another step—learning was fostered and encouraged by religion. When the long wars with England had quite shut out young Scotsmen from completing their education at Oxford and Cam-

"Ancient Laws and Burghs of Scotland." Preface.

bridge, our countrymen, and especially the clergy, bethought them of founding universities of their own. One century (the fifteenth), gave rise to famous schools of theology, literature and science in S. Andrew's, Glasgow, and Aberdeen, all founded and endowed by Bishops. The university city served the cause of spreading cultivation, yet more than the Bishop's See had done." The same learned writer in his lectures on "Scotch Legal Antiquities," traces all the great judicial forms for the administration of equal-handed justice to the learned ecclesiastics, who had drawn copiously and wisely from the Roman fountains. The work of more firmly planting and more widely extending Christianity—*i.e.*, Catholicism—in Scotland was one of the powerful works of reform carried out successfully in the Reformation effected by Queen Margaret and her children. Every abbey and church was a centre of religious learning and charity. The author of "Scotland in the Middle Ages" truly observes that the monks were zealous agriculturists and gardeners at a time when we have no proof that the lay "lord knew anything of the soil except consuming its fruits. They were good neighbours and kind landlords." The tenant of the church was considered the most favoured of agriculturists. The monks' charity and hospitality have been acknowledged by their enemies. Above all they were from their profession and situation addicted to peace. It was by the monks and in the monasteries that the fine arts were

encouraged. National progress in architecture, painting, and sculpture proved that the Catholic Church was truly the best and most noble patron of the arts. Compare Melrose Abbey and Glasgow Cathedral with the barn-like conventicles of the Presbyterianism of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and in this way some faint idea can be obtained of the difference between the spirit and the system of the reformation of Queen Margaret and that of John Knox. David II. was the faithful disciple and follower of his sainted mother. Cosmo Innes* tells us that "he was the founder of the law still more than that of the Church in Scotland. We owe to him all the civil institutions and structure of our present society. When any legislators of a later age wished to stamp their institutions with a name of authority they founded them upon the laws and statutes of the good King David." Buchanan, not seeing apparently how he stultified himself as a deadly enemy of the Catholic faith, says (speaking of King David), "It is true the memory of his parents was of great force to procure him the favour of the people, yet his own virtues were such that he stood in no need of any adventitious help; for as in other virtues he equalled other good kings, so in his condescension to hear the cause of the poor he was much superior to them. He restrained luxury. He far exceeded the beneficence of his parents and kindred in increasing the revenues of the Church. He repaired monasteries, whether decayed by age

or ruined by the wars. He also built new ones from the ground. He was so well beloved that all men thought they had lost in him a father rather than a king. He advanced so much in virtue that if the highest and most learned wits should endeavour to give the idea or pattern of a good king they would never comprehend in their thoughts such an exemplary prince as David showed himself to be."

In the thirteenth century Scotland was unquestionably a prosperous and well governed country. Wise and just laws were ably administered. Noble churches and monasteries stood as monuments both of civilization and religion. The poor were amply provided for without the galling intervention of workhouse authorities, and education was liberally bestowed and encouraged. The Golden Rose was sent by Pope Lucius III. to King William, and during the same reign the Holy See issued a declaration in which it is set forth that the Scottish Church is immediately subject to the Holy See, and thus completely independent of the English Hierarchy. Alexander, the successor of William, is described by Ferdun as "a king—pious, just, and brave; the shield of the Church, the safeguard of the people, and the friend of the miserable." The independence, strength, and prosperity of the kingdom were increased during his reign. Alexander founded Dominican monasteries at Edinburgh, Berwick, Ayr, Aberdeen, Perth, Elgin, Sterling, Montrose, and Inverness; Franciscan monasteries at Berwick and Roxburgh; and a

Cistercian abbey at Balmerino. The monks were the instructors of the people, and led the run of civilization, industry, and improvement. Chalmers tells us that the monks had charge of the principal seminaries. At Aberdeen, he says, there were well regulated schools before the year 1256. "The statutes of the Church of Aberdeen in 1256 enacted that the duty of the Chancellor was to see to the government of the schools, and that the boys were taught grammar and logic. In 1260 Matilda, the Lady of Mall, granted the abbot and monks of Kelso the third of her lands on condition that they would educate and board her son with the best boys who were entrusted to their care." Trade and commerce increased,* and generally the benefits derived from the Catholicism of Queen Margaret and her successors told in the most powerful and favourable manner.

The Church is vindicated in a very thorough manner in the pages of a thoroughly Protestant Review.† There two pictures are presented to our attention: one shows the effects of a Catholic Reformation, the other of a Protestant one. In the former we have to consider Scotland under S. Margaret and her children, in the other we have to gaze upon the bitter fruits of the rapine which formed the main-spring of the obnoxious Reformation.

* On this subject and generally as to the prosperity of Scotland during the reigns of the children of Queen Margaret, see Buchanan, Tyler, and Burton.

† *The Edinburgh Review*, for July, 1867.

tion. The able writer in this Review tells us that "Tradition points to the days of the Alexanders as a time of great well-being. There had been peace with England for more than a hundred years—a blessing never again enjoyed until the Union. In perfect freedom from all thralldom the Scottish Burghs had risen into affluence and importance. The wealth of the nation was evidenced by the purity of the coinage and the absence of all mention of voluntary aids." Everything, in short, that we can learn points in the same direction. The castles of that period, and still more the noble ecclesiastical buildings, bear witness to peace and riches. "The tariff, which was very complicated, is proof of the luxuries in which the inhabitants were enabled to indulge, and a country which at that date imported such things as pepper, almonds, figs, beaver and sable skins, and which carefully provided for the regulation of hotels or taverns, must have been pretty well to do in the world. On the whole *all the facts which can be ascertained leads us to the conclusion that Scotland was a rich, prosperous, and happy country at the close of the thirteenth century.*" So much for a leading Protestant writer in a leading Protestant and Scottish Review with respect to the effects of the Catholic Reformation of S. Margaret and her successors. Let us now hear what he has to say about the evident and notorious effects of the Reformation of John Knox. At the close of the seventeenth century, after Protestantism had been thoroughly

established for more than one hundred years, “The nobility, far too numerous for the country, were poor place-hunters ; the gentry, wandering adventurers. There was no agriculture worthy of the name, no trade, except what was carried on by petty pedlars. Prices were high, severe scarcities frequent. Slavery, though in theory illegal, was really enforced. All colliers and saltmakers were regarded as predial serfs. Kidnapping was a regular trade. There were almost no magistrates ; roads only between the large cities, rarely bridges ; a greater number of idiots than in any other country ; and finally in all times a tenth, in evil days a fifth, of the whole population begging from door to door, living in the constant commission of every kind of crime—a state of things so appalling that a regular system of slavery seemed to Fletcher of Saltoun the only efficient remedy for evils so deeply rooted.”* The *ipsissima verba* of this writer are given, and every syllable he says is proved by the domestic annals and general history of Scotland for the periods to which he refers. Its most profoundly erudite and accomplished writer,† who is an avowed enemy of Catholicism, has studied carefully the effects of the Knoxious Reformation,

* This extract is to be found quoted in the *History of the Catholic Church in Scotland*, by James Walsh. I take this opportunity of expressing my acknowledgments to the writer whose book comprises an immense collection of facts not previously published in a connected form. Every Scottish Catholic ought to have a copy of this work.

† Buckle’s *History of Civilization in Europe*, Vol. III.

or Presbyterianism in Scotland, and proves to demonstration from the very mouths of the ministers themselves that a narrow bigoted tyranny of the worst description was erected in the ruins of Scottish Catholicism. Education was neglected, the fine arts were specially contemned, and everything that could raise the nation was sacrificed to the detestable intolerance of men who, in pretending to favour liberty of conscience, were really its greatest enemies. The plunder of the Church was as greedily retained as it had been easily seized. The nobles allowed churches and monastic buildings to be destroyed and the poor to suffer. Indeed they did not even vouchsafe to give a portion of the illgotten spoils to the Knoxious clergy who had been their tools. The members of this ~~o~~ligarchy, who were really the prime traitors to the Catholic religion, retained with a firm grasp their pieces of silver. With these brutal and ignorant men reform was only another word for plunder.

The great bulwark of Protestantism has always been falsehood. The Catholic Church has been the subject of the foulest calumnies, and nowhere have these calumnies been more successful than in Scotland, where for more than two hundred years a figment of the imagination—a travestie of the Catholic Church styled Popery—has been held up to the detestation of the masses of the people. The Church has only commenced to revive when liberty, education, and the easy and

cheap diffusion of literature tear the mask away which has hitherto concealed the true features of Catholicism. The blasphemous absurdities of Knox, Buchanan, and their descendants are now impossible. And when it is remembered that the doctrines that they so successfully attacked were really those of Queen Margaret, David the Second, Bruce, Wallace, and Alexander the Third, the audacity of such men becomes almost phenomenal. Our surprise is increased when we further reflect that the Catholic Church, which they villified, is the same which converted Europe, manumitted slaves or thralls, raised the status of woman, preserved the Bible, fostered learning, founded corporations, gave good civil laws to the various kingdoms, invariably protected and fed the poor while guarding them against the grinding tyranny of feudalism.*

The Presbyterianism of the Reformers has grievously cursed Scotland for more than two

* On these subjects see the masterly work of Balmer, "*Catholicism and Protestantism compared in their effects on the civilization of Europe.*" This writer proves that it is to the Catholic Church that civilization, social progress and social security are owing. By it the system of slavery so prevalent in ancient Greece and Rome was extinguished, the status of woman was raised so as to equal that of man, a public conscience was formed, beneficence fostered, learning encouraged. It is at the same time established that the universal advance of civilization was impeded by Protestantism. Every Catholic, and every honest inquirer who desires to acquire the doctrines of the sound philosophy of history, should read Balmer.

centuries. Neither civil nor religious liberty spring from a system which pretended to secure both. Phariseeism of a pronounced form was observable everywhere united with ignorance and gross superstition. The representation of the country in Parliament in Scotland as in England was a complete farce. Macaulay tell us that “the Parliament of the Northern Kingdom was a very different body from that which bore the same name in England. . . . The Commissioners of the Burghs were considered merely as retainers of the great nobles.* Numbers of infirm and aged women were burnt as witches, while the intolerant pretensions of the ministers. are almost beyond belief. They established a system of cruel and grinding tyranny to which resistance became impossible, and which not merely affected the general government of the country but interfered with the domestic and private concerns of every individual in it.† So late as the time of Lord Cockburn (in 1794) the full effects of Presbyterianism were visible in the terrible social and religious condition of Scotland. To quote his own words : “There was then in this country, no popular representation, no emancipated Burghs, no effective rival of the established Church, no independent

* Macaulay's *History of England*, Vol. I., p. 93.

† See this clearly proved by very numerous references in Buckle's *History of Civilization in England*, Vol. III. This is a learned work by an avowed infidel, in which the scandalous tyranny of the Kirk is proved from their own most distinguished writers.

press, no free public meetings, and no better trial by jury even in political cases (except high treason) than what was consistent with the circumstances that the jurors were not sent into court under any impartial rule, and that when in court those who were to try the case were named by the presiding judge. The Scotch representatives were only forty-five, of whom thirty were elected for counties and fifteen for towns. Both from its price and its nature (being enveloped in feudal and technical absurdities) the elective franchise in counties where alone it existed was far above the reach of the whole lower, and of a great majority of the middle, and of many even of the higher ranks. There were probably not above 1500 or 2000 county electors in all Scotland, a body not too large to be held, hope included, in Government's hands. The system had grown in reference to the people into as complete a mockery as if it had been invented for their degradation. The people had nothing to do with it. It was all managed by Town Councils of never more than thirty-three members; and every Town Council was self elected, and consequently perpetuated its own interests. The election of either the town or the county member was a matter of such utter indifference to the people that they often only knew of it by the ringing of a bell, or by seeing it next day mentioned in a newspaper; for the farce was generally performed in an apartment from which, if convenient, the public could be excluded, and

never in the open air.”* In truth from the days of John Knox, down to the period in question, poor Scotland was under intolerant and narrow-minded bigots who gave neither religious nor civil liberty. So far as freedom was concerned the Reformation was a complete delusion. But it was more—it was a system of gross hypocrisy, for it pretended to give what it invariably refused. The outrageous mockery was exhibited to the world of a system persecuting men for exercising that liberty of conscience which it was their own special charter to introduce. Learning was positively discouraged, barn-like structures succeeded the noble temples of Catholicism, education was neglected, the universities languished, and the leaders of the Presbyterian sect, which called itself the Church of Scotland, positively gloried in their shame.†

* Cockburn’s *Life of Jeffrey*, Vol. I., pp. 74-76; Irving’s *History of Dumbartonshire*, 1860, pp. 275, 276; and Moore’s *Memoirs*, edited by Lord John Russell, Vol. IV., p. 268, and Vol. VI., p. 163 can be referred to so as to show the wretched condition of political liberty in Scotland.

† See the works of the Scottish Divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth century against learning. So late as the end of the eighteenth century a minister (Home) was persecuted for writing the tragedy of Douglas. Music, painting, and architecture was ostentatiously put aside from the worship of God, and the cultivation of these arts specially neglected. As regards defective school education this is even admitted in Mr. Giles’ *Lectures*, First Part, page (Rev. Charteris) 290. See also same work, page 276 (Rev. Tulloch), who says, “But it is only about the middle of the eighteenth century that literature can be said to have become a feature of the ‘Church of Scotland.’”

CHAPTER II.

Scottish Reformation the work of an oligarchy.—Precise causes of this Reformation.—Establishment of the College of Justice.—James V.—The infant Mary and the Regency.—Conspiracy for the murder of Cardinal Beaton.—George Wishart.—Murder of the Cardinal.

THE student of history finds nothing more distinctly proved than that the Scottish Reformation was the work of an oligarchy. For a long period the crown, the clergy, and the people from whom the clergy sprung were opposed by the nobility. The nobles of Scotland were extremely powerful, and a spirit of prideful competition urged them on to savage warfare, sometimes among themselves, but more frequently against the established authorities. They murdered James I. and James III., imprisoned James V., rebelled against James II. and James III., confined Mary in the Castle of Lochleven, and afterwards deposed her. Their base conspiracies form almost a framework to Scottish history.*

* “But the Scots were seldom distinguished for loyalty” (Laing’s *History of Scotland*, Vol. III., p. 199). “The little respect paid to royalty is conspicuous in every page of Scot-

There were in large* cities no powerful free Burghers—no municipal spirit. The conformation of the country itself favoured the nobles, as its lakes, fens, morasses, and mountains rendered many of the chieftain's retreats almost inaccessible. Frequent savage incursions from the highlands, and long continued sanguinary wars with England, desolated Scotland. Laing says truly that the nobles were too numerous for the extent of the country, “and there was no middle station between a proud landholder, and those who, having no property to lose, were ready for any tumult. A rich yeomanry, numerous merchants and tradesmen of property and all the denominations of the middle class, so important in a flourishing society, were long to be confined to England.” Tytler tells us † that during the unfortunate and lengthy captivity of David II. the nobles became completely insubordinate and affected the style and title of princes. These nobles and chiefs were the scourges and curses of the

tish history” (Brodie's *History of the British Empire*, Vol. I., p. 383). “Scotland seems indeed the natural *foyer* of rebellion as Egypt is of the plague” (Wilkes's speech in the House of Commons reported in *Parliamentary History*, Vol. XIX., p. 810). “Never was any race of monarchs more unfortunate than the Scottish. Their reigns were generally turbulent and disastrous, and their end often tragical” (Nimmo's *History of Stirlingshire*, p. 219).

* In 1572, one of the chief towns (Aberdeen) had only 2,900 inhabitants.

† Vol. II., p. 86.

country. War and rapine were their principal employments, and such insecurity frequently prevailed that peaceful pursuits were almost impossible.* It is notorious that even the burgesses sent to Parliament were completely under the sway of the nobles who ruled their towns. As one consequence of the opposition of the nobles to the Church, they detested and despised learning. After the time of John Knox in 1567, when the famous chief, Walter Scott of Harden, was married, we are told by Chambers in his *Annals* that the contract was signed by a notary, because none of the parties could sign their names.†

The Earls of Crawford and of Ross in the north of Scotland, and the Earl of Douglas in the south were each strong, but when united their power completely overawed that of the monarch.‡

* Burton in his *Criminal Trials of Scotland* tells us, speaking of the seventeenth century, that "To be without a chief involved a kind of disrepute, and those who had no distinct personal position of their own would find it necessary to become a Gordon or a Crichton, as prudence or inclination might point out." "The protective surname of Douglas," is referred to in Pitcairn's *Criminal Trials*, and the great importance attached to the name of MacGregor can be seen in Skene's *Highlanders*, Vol. II., p. 252.

† In 1564 Robert Scott of Thirlstane, ancestor of Lord Napier, could not sign his name.—Pitcairn's *Criminal Trials in Scotland*, Vol. III., p. 394.

‡ Lawson tells us in his *Book of Perth*, p. 31, that even Perth had to be abandoned as the capital because it was dangerous for the sovereign to live in it. So recently as 1668 the *Records of the Synod of Aberdeen* prove that High-

(consequently we cannot be surprised that when James V. died of a broken heart, and the crown devolved upon an infant, the nobles were able to head an irresistible party of traitors, who acted in concert with Henry VIII. and Elizabeth to betray the cause of royalty and of the Catholic Church in Scotland). Several apostate priests of bad character, including John Knox, were used as tools only to be thrown aside unrewarded when they had done their work. The usual specious and unsound arguments based upon the bad lives of many dignitaries of the Catholic Church were, of course, used largely on this subject, the grossest exaggerations and calumnies were indulged in.* But if we look thoroughly into this absurd ground for a radical change in doctrine we shall find that abuses simply arose from the free and normal action of the Church having been paralysed. Unfortunately there was only one Queen Margaret. During the Catholic reign of her husband and his sons the great teaching landers carried off women from that city or its neighbourhood. The *Aberdeen Burghs Records* show that the people then were in frequent fear of attacks from the retainers of great nobles.

* See the outrageous manner in which a large number of castles in Fifeshire were declared to have been inhabited by mistresses of Cardinal Beaton and the gross and unseemly references to the marriages of his daughters. He was a widower when he entered the Church. The outrageous calumnies against a queen and a woman—Mary of Scotland—prove what “the Reformers” were able to do in this direction.

power was free, but subsequently it was trammeled and interfered with in the grossest manner. McCrie* tells us that "Scotland from her local situation had been less exposed to disturbance from the encroaching ambition, vexatious exactions, and fulminating anathemas of the Vatican Court than the countries in the immediate vicinity of Rome." Now nothing is more proved in mediæval history than the fact that nations have become corrupt precisely in proportion to their alienation from or opposition to the Holy See.† Church dignitaries in Scotland became by degrees so dependent on the secular power that the latter succeeded in thrusting its own creatures into sacred offices, and in maintaining them there contrary to the canons. King James V., for instance, provided for his illegitimate children by making them abbots and priors of Holyrood House, Kelso, Melrose, Coldingham, and S. Andrew's. They received the incomes of benefices, committing the duties of their charge to others, and though they seldom took orders they ranked as clergymen, and by their vices brought disgrace upon the clerical body.‡ When we find an open contempt for canonical freedom of election, and a cruel and

* *Life of John Knox*, p. 18, an ultra Protestant book in which there is a most elaborate attempt to whitewash John Knox.

† See the masterly essays of M. J. Spalding, Archbishop of Baltimore.

‡ Lingard's *History of England*, Vol. VII., p. 269, note.

forced separation from the fountain head of authority we can no longer be surprised at the sad degeneracy of clerical morals. The doctrine had not changed, the Church denounced then, as it did in the days of S. Margaret, all that was unlawful. But it is necessary that scandals must come. The tares have never ceased to grow with the wheat since Our Saviour preached on the hills of Galilee. The best eras of the Church have always been accompanied by the history of the bad conduct of many of her children as well as by the history of heresies, but it is a great error to lay too much stress upon the former as a cause for the latter. The principle of submission to authority in matters of faith has always encountered resistance. The inherent pride of man is the fruitful source of heresy and infidelity. To this we can attribute the rebellions against faith which have occurred in every age of Christianity. If the sixteenth century had been an exception to this rule the question would have to be asked, "Looking at the nature of the human mind how is it possible that no sect appeared in that age?" One of the greatest philosophical writers of modern times * makes this remark and goes on to say, "As soon as error was preached in the sixteenth century, whatever may have been its origin, occasion, and pretext, as soon as a certain number of followers assembled around its banner, forthwith Protestantism makes its appear-

* Balmer's *Protestantism and Catholicism Compared in their Effects on the Civilization of Europe*, p. 5.

ance, in all its extent, with its transcendent importance, its divisions and subdivisions ; I see it with boldness and energy make a general attack on all the doctrines and discipline taught and observed by the Church. In place of Luther, Zuinglius, and Calvin let us suppose Arius, Nestorius and Pelagius ; in place of the errors of the former, let them teach the errors of the latter ; it will all lead to the same result. The errors will excite sympathy ; they will find defenders ; they will animate enthusiasts ; they will spread, they will be propagated with the rapidity of fire ; they will be diffused ; they will throw sparks in all directions ; they will all be defended with a show of knowledge and erudition ; creeds will change unceasingly ; a thousand professions of faith will be drawn up ; the liturgy will be altered—will be destroyed ; the bonds of discipline will be broken ; we shall have to sum up all in one word, Protestantism.”

The war between the Scottish aristocracy and the clergy of the Church of Scotland was waged fiercely during the reign of James V. It was by means of the efforts of Beaton, Archbishop of S. Andrew's, that the king had effected his escape from the Douglases and was enabled to take refuge in the Castle of Stirling.* Ever afterwards this

* Buckle, speaking of the re-action that then took place, says that “this was undoubtedly the proximate cause of the establishment of Protestantism in Scotland.” Vol. III., p. 58.

great ecclesiastic was his principal adviser and friend.) The chancellorship of the kingdom was conferred upon the Archbishop of Glasgow, the Abbot of Holyrood became treasurer, and the Bishop of Dunkeld was made Privy Seal. No follower of the house of Douglas was allowed to approach within twelve miles of the Court under pain of treason, and an act of attainder was passed against the chief of that powerful family. The Earl of Angus had been driven out of Scotland, while the Earls of Bothwell, Maxwell and Home, as well as the Barons of Johnston, Buccleuch, and Polwarth were cast into prison. Other noblemen were severely punished, and the clergy held the highest offices of the State. (In the interest of justice and of the people it was evidently necessary that a competent High Court should be established, and the Archbishop of Glasgow instigated the formation of one of the noblest institutions of Scotland—the College of Justice.* This was a deadly blow aimed at the jurisdiction of barons and counts, where each nobleman in his own castle was the tyrant of his neighbourhood. In this the clergy were really the friends of liberty, of justice, and of the people, but they were priests of the Catholic Church and therefore debarred from any praise in works on the history of Scotland. Let any impartial man make himself thoroughly acquainted with the facts connected with the

* Consisting of fifteen members qualified for the office. This is the origin of the justly famous Court of Session.

events of the Reformation and he will be thoroughly surprised at the audacious conspiracy against truth, which lasts even to the present time. In recent lectures by men who are considered eminent Divines of the Presbyterian Church * a steadfast attempt is made to gloss over and excuse the crimes and *faults of the ruffian of the Reformation* and his followers, while special pleading of the most dishonest character is used to justify treason and crime. There is no real depth in the historical research of such Divines, and fortunately a spirit of inquiry is now in existence, under which it is even possible to question the dicta of Scottish ministers. The Catholic Church has been reviving, and must revive rapidly, in the land of S. Margaret under the influence of liberty and of education, the narrow oppressive tyranny of Calvanistic ministers, under which Scotland groaned so long,† is

* *S. Giles' Lectures*, first series. Sedition against the legitimate Government is evidently approved of, and the most appalling crimes are excused if they be for the Gospel. The end evidently justifies the means. The following specimen of nonsense is the deliberate opinion of a chaplain to Her Majesty the Queen—the Rev. D. Macleod. He says (*S. Giles' Lectures*, p. 129). “The duty of the Church was to make known what the Scriptures taught, and *unless contrary Scripture could be shown* it was the duty of the king and the people to submit!” Who was to be the judge of the “contrary Scripture?” Suppose this nonsense was carried into practice in Scotland to-day, what would be the result?

† See Buckle's *History of Civilization in England*, Vol. III.

practically at an end, and the Catholic Hierarchy is once more firmly established in the land of Columba and Kentigern, of Margaret, Malcolm, and David, of Wallace and of Bruce. Scotland has been too long under a dark cloud, but, thanks be to God, the diffusion of education has been a source of enlightenment. Men begin to see that the absurd phantasmal figures which they imagined to be the real doctrines of the Church are mere creations of the imagination. The great bulwark of Protestantism, falsehood, is falling down in every direction, and men of intelligence are now swiftly ranging themselves on the side of truth. Knowledge and the diffusion of truth are too strong for the Protestant sects. The most learned men are always in the van of conversion to the Church, and it is only over the unthinking and prejudiced who will not take the trouble to inquire that the diluted remains of the Presbyterian tyranny of one hundred years ago has any control. The spread of Calvinistic heresies, and their rampant continuance in Scotland are really principally to be attributed to the ignorance of the people and the comparative feeble means of civilization and enlightenment, united to the constant stream of calumny poured forth against the doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church.*

* In the *Fair Maid of Perth* Sir Walter Scott tells us of a valiant man who used to show his prowess by attacking "a wooden Soldau" which he had erected close to his house. He was always an easy conqueror. The Presby-

The establishment of the College of Justice exasperated the nobles of Scotland almost to madness, and stern hatred of the clergy and desire of revenge induced them to become traitors to their country as well as to their creed.* A secret understanding was soon arrived at with Henry VIII., who desired to take away that independence for which Wallace had died and Bruce successfully fought. The first Reformers indeed cared nothing for religion, but a great deal for revenge and for aggrandizement. Their characters were as bad as their motives, and their conduct was quite on a par with both. Treason was accompanied by assassination, destruction, rapine, and plunder.

In 1538 James V. married Mary of Guise, a member of one of the principal Catholic families of Europe, and David Beaton, who negotiated the marriage, was in 1539 made Archbishop of S. Andrew's, and became the chief adviser of the king during the rest of his reign.

According to the laws of all countries, heresy, terian ministers set up a figure of the Church—a thoroughly imaginative “Romish abomination”—and are used to demolish this in their sermons and books with amazing intrepidity and success.

* See Buckle's *History of Civilization in England*, Vol. III., p. 61. This author says, “As the enmity between the aristocracy and the Church grew more bitter, just in the same proportion did the desire to reform the Church become more marked. P. 62, “They hardly cared what heresy they embraced so long as they damaged the Church.”

particularly when united with sedition, was punishable as a crime, and many of the people proceeded against proved that religion and politics were indissolubly united by "embracing the interests of the Douglases."* This family was maintained in high favour in England.† Buckle truly says,‡ "With such a combination of parties in a country where, there being no middle class, the people counted for nothing, but followed wherever they were led, it is evident that the success or failure of the Reformation in Scotland was simply a question of the success or failure of the nobles. They were bent on revenge. The only doubt was as to their being strong enough to gratify it. Against them they had the Crown and the Church. On their side they had the feudal traditions, the spirit of clanship, the devoted obedience of their innumerable retainers, and, what was equally important, that love of names and of family associations for which Scotland is still remarkable, but which, in the sixteenth century, possessed an influence difficult to exaggerate." In order to prevent the country becoming an appendage of England war was absolutely necessary, and in 1542 James

* Tytler, Vol. IV., p. 241.

† In Brown's *History of Glasgow* it is stated that the Douglas's alliances and power were equal to one half of the nobility of Scotland. By means of feudal covenants and bonds of manrent the Douglas could rely with confidence on many of the most powerful nobles.

‡ Vol. III., p. 66.

V. took the field against the hereditary enemies of the independence of his country. When assembled on the field the nobles traitorously declined to advance, and James, filled with sorrow, was obliged to return home and give orders for the disbandment of the army. A few of the Peers of Scotland neither so pussillanimous nor treasonable as the others, felt ashamed at the cowardly desertion with which their monarch had been treated and desired to attack the enemy, but there was disunion and confusion in the camp, of which the English took a terrible advantage. Bannockburn was again revenged. Three hundred English cavalry drove ten thousand Scottish troops before them, and when the news reached the king of this signal victory of treason and heresy he sank into a long stupor, refused all comfort, and died of a broken heart.* The crown then devolved upon his unfortunate infant daughter, Mary, who in her turn had eventually to succumb to the conspiracies of heresy and treason. A grand opportunity now occurred for the enemies of Scotland, as there could be little difficulty in robbing an infant of her inheritance. But there was one man sufficiently brave and sufficiently able to baulk them. This was a great ecclesiastic, who at once incurred the deadly hatred of the traitors partly because he was a dignitary of the Church of their forefathers, but principally because he was a true Scottish patriot who could neither be bribed nor circumvented.

* Tytler, Vol. IV., p. 264.

Against Cardinal Beaton every shaft that calumny can invent has consequently been hurled, and the assassination of his character as much as that of his person became the principal business of the Reformers. Cardinal Beaton had been appointed, by the solemn testament of the king,* to be guardian of the queen and governor of the kingdom. Of course this did not affect the Scripture-loving Reformers in the least, who lost no time in taking the regency from him and putting in his place the Earl of Arran, who happened at the time to be a staunch Protestant, "though on a fitting occasion he afterwards changed his opinions." Lord Maxwell, who is described as "very venal, and who neither knew nor cared much about doctrine" (see Buckle Vol. III., p. 71), proposed that the people should read the Bible in either a Scotch or English translation. The

* Buckle says (Vol. III., p. 70), "It has often been said that the will was forged; but for such an assertion I cannot find the slightest evidence, except the declaration of Arran (Sadler's *State papers* Edinburgh, 1809, Vol. I., p. 138), and the testimony, if testimony it can be called, of Scottish historians who do not profess to have examined the handwriting, and who, being themselves Protestants, seem to suppose that the fact of a man being a Cardinal qualifies him for every crime." Lyon's *History of S. Andrew's*, Edinburgh, 1843, declares in favour of its being genuine. Tytler, Lawson, and Keith leave it doubtful. Tytler tries generally to be just, but he sometimes shows the cloven foot of prejudice and preconceived ideas. Buckle is a bitter enemy of Catholicism, and tries to abuse it and its members, as well as the Reformers.

proposition was adopted by the Lords of the Articles, and on their authority introduced into Parliament and passed.* So soon as the nobles had obtained the upper hand they commenced to quarrel among themselves about the division of the property which belonged to the Church and the poor. A large number, Keith tells us in his *History of Affairs of Church and State in Scotland*, were named "English Lords." They formed by far the more active section, and were frequently supplied with money from England. In 1544, however, war broke out between the two countries and it almost seemed for a time as if the nation would once more be united against the hereditary enemy of Scottish independence. Archbishop Beaton headed the patriots—but, alas! this was only for a time. The nobles were determined to destroy the Church, and as their chief opponent could not be removed by fair means they resolved upon his murder. In a conversation held in the year 1543 between Sir Ralph Sadler, the English Ambassador and the Chief of the Reformers, and the Earl of Arran the latter used an expression concerning the Cardinal to which the former replied, "By God, he shall never come out of prison whilst I may have mine own will, *except it be to his further mischief!*" Sadler "allowed the same will," and said, "It were pity but he should

* This was the greatest nonsense, however, as there were no Bibles to read. One copy cost more than £4.

receive such reward as his merits did require.”* Tytler tells us that the first suggestion of the murder was in 1544, but it is evident that it had at least implicitly been determined on previously.†

The Earl of Arran although unscrupulous was weak; at first declaring in favour of treason and Henry VIII., he caused Cardinal Beaton to be imprisoned on an absurd and fictitious charge of having persuaded the Duke of Guise to levy an army; but eventually the Cardinal was able to obtain his liberty by means of a private treaty. The King of England demanded the custody of the young Queen, the government of the kingdom, and the possession of the royal castles during the minority. Threats, bribes, and promises were tried, but at last Henry was forced to see that the traitors were not stern enough, and that it was necessary to temporise and wait. Cardinal Beaton now acted with the utmost promptitude and ability. He secured the northern division of Scotland, obtained possession of the young Queen

* *State Papers of Henry VIII.* Sadler’s *Papers* Vol. I., p. 77.

† To show in important matters how much in the dark the so called historians were, or how dishonestly they concealed anything against the Reformers, Tytler tells us (*History of Scotland*, Vol. IV., p. 337,) that this plot of the English king and the Scotch Reformers to murder Cardinal Beaton was “entirely unknown either to our Scottish or English historians, and now, after the lapse of nearly three centuries, has been discovered in the secret correspondence of the States paper office.”

(Mary), and removed her from Linlithgow to the strong castle of Stirling. By dexterously using the claim of the Earl of Lennox to the regency on the ground of the Earl of Arran's alleged illegitimacy, the latter was brought to his knees. Lennox, subsequently carried away by his passion for Margaret Douglas, daughter of the Earl of Angus, joined the reforming faction. A sanguinary war, which lasted two years, and caused the devastation by English troops of a large portion of Scotland, then broke out, and the spectacle was witnessed of the herds of the Reformation joining with the hereditary enemy of their country for the destruction of the lives and independence of their countrymen. Lennox had received the hand of Margaret Douglas on condition that he should deliver up the Castle of Dumbarton, but the governor and garrison expelled him with ignominy. So enraged did the infamous tyrant, who inaugurated the English Reformation, become on seeing himself baulked that he ordered the hostages at Carlisle to be put to death, and seeing clearly that Cardinal Beaton, who was staunch in his religion, and true to his country, formed the principal obstacle to the success of his views, gave his complete sanction to a conspiracy for the immediate assassination of the great Archbishop.*

* "His highness reputing the fact not meet to be set forward expressly by his majesty will not seem to have to do in it; and yet not misliking the offer, thinketh good that they be exhorted to proceed." Tytler Vol. V., p. 389.

The proto-martyr of the Scottish Reformation, George Wishart,* was on the 17th of April, 1544, sent by Crichton, Laird of Brunston, to the Earl of Hertford at Newcastle to communicate the particulars of the plot for the assassination of Cardinal Beaton. Wishart was unquestionably *particeps criminis* in this design, and was leagued with traitors against the legitimate Government of the country. He subsequently proceeded to the English Court, and was there thoroughly successful in securing Henry's approval. On the 17th of May, 1544, at Carlisle, a treaty was concluded between several leading lords of the Reformation and the English King, by which pensions and rewards were secured to the former, while the latter traitorously agreed to renounce their allegiance to their own Queen, and deliver up her person. At the same time, to add loathsome hypocrisy to deceit and perfidy, they stipulate that the word of God "from which all truth and honour proceedeth," is to be truly taught! † The cruel ravages of Henry's army in Scotland and a

* For the particulars given as to Wishart (the proto-martyr!) and the assassination of Cardinal Beaton, see Tytler, Vol IV., p. 315, *et sequentum*.

† The most powerful of these Reformers, Glencairn, had in 1543 undertaken to convey the English army from Carlisle to Glasgow, and Tytler tells us (Vol. IV., p. 319), "Only a few days after the retreat from Hertford, we find him engaged in a negotiation, which, considering the cruel ravages then inflicted by the English army, reflects little credit on his love of country."

defeat which Glencairn, his ally, experienced made the cause of treason and heresy appear in a very awkward position. Religion was indeed made a cloak for malice, and under the hypocritical pretense of reforming the doctrines of the Catholic Church a number of ignorant and rapacious noblemen assisted the arch-enemy of their country's independence. But throughout the Cardinal was altogether too able for his opponents. He had been made Legate *a latere* by the Pope, had triumphantly defeated Henry in the war of independence, by securing the national approval of a treaty of peace and marriage with France. Henry's animosity was now inflamed to deadly hatred, and the speedy destruction of the Cardinal by foul means was earnestly hastened. The proto-martyr Wishart, in the meantime, who was in this plot,* and had himself been guilty of sedition, was caught, tried, justly found guilty of sedition and hanged for that crime. His body was buried after he was strangled. The most gross falsehood was circulated, and as even yet audaciously repeated, about the Cardinal gazing with pleasure at his execution. This has been discovered to be a complete fabrication. The principal conspirators who had banded together to take the life of the man

* Tytler tells us (Vol. IV., p. 361), that Wishart lived under the protection of Brunston, and that the latter was "a dark and busy intriguer who for more than two years had been organizing a conspiracy for the assassination of the Cardinal."

whom they could not defeat by fair means were Henry, chief Protestant Reformer and King of England, together with the Arch Scottish Reformers, the Earls of Angus, Glencairn (anxious about the Bible as the source of truth and honour), Marshal, and Sir George Douglas. To the chief conspirators were added John Lesley, brother of the Earl of Rethes, and his nephew Norman Lesley, with Kirkcaldy of Grange.*

On the evening of the 28th of May, 1546, Norman Lesley, John Lesley, and William Kirkcaldy of Grange with five followers met secretly together at S. Andrew's. At daybreak the drawbridge of the castle in which the Cardinal resided was lowered for the purpose of admitting masons employed on the new works. The conspirators stood ready to take advantage of this opportunity. Norman Lesley and three of his men quickly passed the gates and inquired if the Cardinal were yet awake. During the conversation Kirkcaldy of Grange, John Melville, and their followers managed to enter unobserved. John Lesley now made his appearance, and as the porter knew him to be a notorious enemy of the Cardinal, he rushed to the drawbridge and had succeeded in unloosing its iron fastening when

* An entertaining biography of Kirkcaldy of Grange by Grant, published by Blackwood and Co., shows the extraordinary escapades, treasons, and perfidy of this noted "Reformer," who finished his life by being hanged at Edinburgh by his brother Reformers.

Lesley in an instant sprung across the gap, murdered the porter, cast his dead body into the fosse and secured the keys of the fortress. Kirkcaldy knew the castle well, and stationed himself on guard at the only place where egress was possible. The other conspirators went quietly to work, awaking and leading away the gentlemen and servants of the household as well as the workmen, so that in a short time no fewer than one hundred and fifty people were turned out by a mere handful of armed men. Then the portcullis was dropped, the gates were closed, and the conspirators were ready to murder the Cardinal. Treasonable arrangements with England had failed, so the truest patriot in Scotland had to die for his country and his creed by the hands of assassins—filled with hatred and revenge, making liberty (of religion) a cloak for the foulest malice and the greatest possible crime. These lovers of the Scripture and Reformers of the Catholic Religion had now nothing to do but to murder an old priest in cold blood. The Cardinal, hearing unusual sounds of bustle and disturbance, raising his window, inquired what it meant. He was told that Norman Lesley had taken the castle. Having gone quickly to the postern and found it guarded, the Cardinal hastily returned to his room and barricaded the door with heavy furniture. John Lesley came up and demanded admittance.

“Who are you?” said the Cardinal.

“My name is Lesley,” he replied.

“Is it Norman, I must have Norman, he is my friend,” alluding probably to a bond of manrent which bound Norman to support him.

“Nay, I am not Norman, but John, and with me you must be contented.” This Reformer then called for fire in order to burn the door down. It was quickly brought up, but when just about to be applied the door was opened and all the Reformers rushed violently in, threw themselves upon the defenceless old man, and stabbed him to death. But this first great deed of the Reformation would not have been complete if it had not been accompanied by disgusting puritanical cant. Melville, reproving the violence of the other Reformers, called upon the Cardinal to repent—although he gave him no time to do so. The death of “the holy Wishart” was it seems the principal crime of the Archbishop. “Remember,” said the brutal assassin, “that the mortal stroke I am now about to deal is not the mercenary blow of a hired assassin, but the just vengeance* which hath fallen on an obstinate and cruel enemy of Christ and the Holy Gospel.”† The ruffian then passed

* “Vengeance is mine,” saith the Lord. “I will repay.” Every one of these brutal assassins died a violent death. They were the vanguard of the Reforming army, and the Reformers gloried in the murder, John Knox particularly extolled the deed. “These are thy gods, oh ! Israel.” Alas! poor Scotland.

† It must be admitted that we are indebted for this speech to Knox’s *History*, pp. 71, 72, and like Wishart’s dying prophecies and speeches, it is very probable Melville’s was



his sword through his dying and unresisting victim. This was the first great triumph of the Reformation committed by leading Reformers, and gloried in by their leader, John Knox.

never spoken. John Knox and Buchanan were liars of the first water, who invented and distorted facts to suit themselves.

CHAPTER III.

Events following the death of Cardinal Beaton.—His character.—John Knox approves of his murder.—Proceedings of the murderers ; their crimes and debaucheries.—France under Strozzi captures the fortress of S. Andrew's.—League of the reforming nobles with Henry VIII.—War with England.—Battle of Pinkie.—Treason and war.—Rule of the Queen Regent.—Knox “writes up No Popery,” and then runs away to Geneva.—Invited back.—His cowardice.—Progress of revolt.—At last it is safe for Knox to return.—Life and character of John Knox.

THE murder by the Reformers of the great, vigorous, and able governor of the kingdom was a blow to Catholicism and to the independence of Scotland. The Queen was an infant, and treason was rife. The subjugation of the country under the dominion of England and the establishment of a system of Church plunder styled reformation now seemed more hopeful than ever, as the principal obstacle to the schemes of the conspirators had been removed. At first, however, a feeling of natural horror prevailed, and we find that the Queen Regent and Arran exerted themselves to

punish the assassins and their accomplices. At S. Andrew's extraordinary and interesting events occurred. The Reformers who had murdered the Cardinal were joined in the fortress by a number of those who approved of their deed, including the great Apostle of the Scottish Reformation, John Knox. It was here that Knox performed the farce of declining to preach publicly, and at last was induced with feigned reluctance to consent. To him and to his cause nothing was more satisfactory than the murder of the Cardinal, and both by word and deed he showed his hearty approval of it. The Rev. Charles Lawson (*History of the Church in Scotland*) writing of these events says: "Cardinal David Beaton, before whose indomitable spirit the Protestant faith trembled in Scotland, was in many respects the greatest, the most active, and the most distinguished ecclesiastic that Scotland had produced before the Reformation. The character of this prelate has been most keenly delineated, but his enemies have been, for the most part, his historians. There was no one of his age of whom the Protestants stood in such fear and terror. His master mind grasped at all their plans, and circumvented all their designs; and so thoroughly did they dread him, that not only his death, but the manner of it, inspired them with the most frantic joy and exultation." *

* This is testimony from a Protestant clergyman thoroughly acquainted with the history of Scotland.

Every honest man in Scotland felt indignant at the foul assassination of Cardinal Beaton. The Parliament declared the Reformers who had killed him guilty of treason, and an army was assembled under the governor, which proceeded to invest the Castle of S. Andrew's. A badly conducted siege, after having been prosecuted for some time, was abandoned, and a convention agreed upon. An armistice then ensued. Of the conduct of the besieged during the armistice, Buchanan, the bitter foe of the Catholic Church, thus speaks : “They who held the castle being thus out of all fear of their enemy, did not only make frequent excursions into the neighbouring parts, and commit depredations with fire and sword all round ; but as if the liberty got by their arms was to be spent in adulteries and such vices, they ran into all the wickedness which idle persons are subject to, for they measured right or wrong by no other rule than their own lusts.” These are the men whom we have already seen conferring ministerial orders upon John Knox ! But some measure of punishment was meted out to them. Sixteen armed galleons, commanded by Leo Strozzi, Prior of Capua, were sent by France to the assistance of the Scottish authorities. Their leader was a soldier of tried experience and great reputation. So skilfully were his vessels disposed that at full tide they commanded the seaward outworks of the castle. Large ordnance and great battering rams were landed and placed in advantageous positions.

At last so hopeless did the position of the garrison become that Knox was able to make religious capital by predicting that their walls would be shivered. An effective and irresistible cannonade was so carried on that it did not require prophecy to predict its effects. The garrison had to yield unconditionally, and were taken to France, where John Knox and other assassins were sentenced to the galleys and imprisonment. Of the fortress itself not one stone was left on another—a complete destruction, attributed by some to the zeal of fulfilling an injunction of the Canon law enjoining the extermination of any building in which a murder so foul as that of Cardinal Beaton's had been committed.

The success of the governor against the Reformers was followed by a discovery which proved that treason against creed and country was of the most widely spread and serious character. In the chamber of Balnaves, at S. Andrew's, a register book was found which contained the signatures of no fewer than *two hundred noblemen and gentlemen* to a compact which bound them to the service of England,* and thus to the betrayal of their country. Among the lords of the Reformation was the Earls of Bothwell, Cassilis, and Maxwell, with Lord Kilmaurs and Lord Gray. Bothwell's price was the promise of the hand of the Duchess of Suffolk, aunt to the English monarch. At the same time it was discovered that

* Tytler, Vol. IV., p. 288.

Lord Gray was tampering with the Earls of Athole, Errol, Sunderland, and Crawford, to whom he advised that bribes should be given.* At this time Glencairn submitted a secret offer of assistance to the English king. For an adequate consideration he desired to co-operate with his friends and vassals "who were favourers of the word of God." Cassilis and Lennox were devoutly in favour of the same lucrative cause. Henry, whose design was subjugation,† graciously accepted all these offers, and from this time the fate of the Catholic Church in Scotland was sealed. The reforming nobles leagued together in treasonable union against the independence of their country, and helped by England were too powerful for any resistance. The means used by them to gain their object we will find to consist of treason, falsehood, robbery, and murder,

On the 2nd of September, 1547, the Protector (Duke of Somerset), invaded Scotland with a large army, and was enabled by means of treason to march safely towards the capital.‡ A Scottish force, in which there were four thousand Highlanders and a number of Isle-men, met him close to Musselburgh, within a few miles of Edinburgh, and sustained a disastrous defeat on the fatal field

* Lord Gray to the Protector Somerset, 28th August, 1547, quoted by Tytler.

† Tytler, Vol. IV., p. 390.

‡ Tytler, Vol. IV., p. 393 and seq.

of Pinkie.* At this juncture secret cabals in England against Somerset forced him to return to his own country. Cruelty and destruction marked the progress of the conquering army, and in the retreat of Somerset through the Merse and Teviotdale the chief men of these districts swore fealty to King Edward and surrendered their castles. Tytler tells us that "the land was shamefully deserted by the greater part of its nobility. The Earls of Glencairn, Angus, Cassilis, and Lennox, the Lords Maxwell, Boyd, Gray, and Cranston, the Lairds of Armistun and Brunston, with many other barons, had entered the service of England, given hostages for their fidelity, and sworn to secret articles which bound them to obey the orders of the Protector." Argyle was an exception, but a seasonable bribe of one thousand crowns caused him to change his mind and join his reforming brethren.† Huntley, Maxwell, and Sir George Douglas unscrupulously imitated his example.‡ Double treason, however, awaited the

* The Scottish army at Pinkie included a powerful body of priests and monks, who marched under a white banner, on which was painted a female kneeling before a crucifix with her hair dishevelled. Underneath was the embroidered motto, "*Afflictæ Ecclesiæ ne obliviscaris.*" This is a most affecting circumstance, well worthy the theme of poet and painter—the last rally in the cause of a Church veritably "done to death by traitors."

† Tytler, Vol. IV., p. 410.

‡ Tytler, Vol. IV., p. 411.

English. Maxwell was bought by a higher bribe to desert their banner, and when attacked by Angus his forces turned round and slaughtered their Saxon allies without honour or mercy. The English soldiers became afterwards celebrated for their cruelty, and priests and friars who had been captured were dragged along with halters round their necks and threatened with instant execution. The ravages of the plague succeeded the ravages of war. At this juncture a *coup d'état* was wisely executed by the Queen Regent taking the infant Queen to France. A French fleet enabled the voyage to be made in safety. Mary, then an infant of six years of age, embarked at Dumbarton with the four Marys*—playmates of her own age—and safely arrived at the harbour of Brest on the 13th of August, 1548. The war was continued with great ferocity, but by means of French reinforcements the English were everywhere defeated. At last it was ended by a peace very favourable to Scotland, concluded between England and France, and proclaimed at Edinburgh in the month of April, 1550. The rule of the Queen Regent was in many respects wise and conciliatory, although great offence was given by the appointment of Frenchmen to high offices in the State. During the reign of Mary of England peace continued, and in consequence of tranquillity it was possible to provide for the better internal govern-

* From the families of Fleming, Beaton, Seton, and Livingston.

ment of the kingdom. In 1555, at a Parliament held in Edinburgh, several judicious laws for the better administration of justice were enacted. These were due to the wise advice of Henry Sinclair, Dean of Glasgow, who is described as an ecclesiastic equally celebrated for his statesmanship and learning.*

The unfortunate war between France and England induced the Regent to endeavour to send an armed force into the adjoining country. The Scottish nobles declined to assist, and the old feud was thus again completely re-opened. The treaty of marriage between Mary of Scotland and Francis, the Dauphin of France, was concluded when the former was only fifteen years of age. Shortly afterwards Mary of England died, and was succeeded by her sister Elizabeth. The accession of the latter was at once looked upon as a triumph of the Reformation. Soon afterwards a treaty was entered into for the cessation of *hostilities between England and Scotland*. In reality, however, the war between the two countries was waged more bitterly and more dangerously than formerly. Elizabeth was a mistress of dissimilation, and carried on, but more astutely, the same policy as that of her father. To destroy the independence of Scotland and the power of its young Queen—who was always looked upon by Elizabeth with deadly hatred as a dangerous rival—it was necessary to subsidise and assist the reforming nobility, who

* Tytler, Vol. V., p. 22.

were hostile to the Catholic Church and to the established Government of Scotland. Duly instructed, an apostate monk named Willoch caused a public tumult in Edinburgh on the occasion of an ecclesiastical procession, but it is significant that the cause had but little advanced, and Knox was surprised to find the friends of the Protestant opinions unresolved upon the great question as to whether it was their duty openly to separate from the Catholic Church.* Violent measures were evidently necessary, and Knox was therefore employed to make use of them. In pulpit harangues the Catholic doctrines were most grossly misrepresented. In fact, a fictitious church was held up to public execration. The notorious calumny that the Mass is idolatrous was constantly insisted upon, and the most rancorous abuse and outrageous falsehoods were used with impunity as weapons against the faith of a people who were completely overawed by the power of a reforming nobility, who used the ministers of the new opinions as tools for political purposes. But violence of language was not sufficient; it had to be accompanied by actions of a kindred character. As a preliminary measure Knox thought it desirable to send a letter to the Queen Regent exhorting her not only to protect the reformed preachers, but to listen to what he styled their doctrines. This proposition was treated with contempt, which the apostle never forgave. The Queen, openly turn-

* Tytler, Vol. V., p. 36.

ing to the Archbishop of Glasgow, handed him Knox's letter, and asked if his lordship was desirous of reading a pasquinade.

The time was now a very critical one, and John Knox evidently felt afraid. An invitation suddenly arrived asking him to become pastor of a congregation at Geneva, and he precipitately accepted it. Tytler very naturally expresses great surprise at this conduct, and tells us truly enough, that this was specially a time when the infant reformed congregation in Scotland required nurture and protection, whereas at Geneva there was both safety and prosperity. There can be no doubt that Knox was seriously alarmed, and had good reason for it. He had been reported to the magistrates as a traitor and seducer of the people. In spite of the fact that he had before bitterly upbraided himself for deserting his flock in a time of peril, he now without hesitation repeated the same conduct. Tytler, who tries at all times to defend him, is compelled very reluctantly to say that "judging with all charity, it must be admitted, that whilst his writings at this season had all the impassioned zeal, his conduct betrayed some want of the ardent courage of the martyr."* This is the apostle who is emphatically declared "to have never feared the face of man!" Knox was subsequently tried, condemned, and burnt in effigy at the cross of Edinburgh.

The principal Reforming preachers left in

* Tytler, Vol. V., p. 39.

Scotland were William Harlow, an Edinburgh tailor, Paul Methven,* a baker from Dundee, and two apostate monks named Willoch and Douglas. Mobs followed these turbulent men, and in a short time the nobility, thirsting for the plunder of the Church, thought they saw their way to an extensive scheme of revolt under which it would be possible for them, in the name of religion, to seize upon the property of the Church and the poor. In reply to a summons from the Government requiring the preachers of the Reformation to answer for their conduct, a tumultuous assemblage of Barons surrounded the palace, and their bold conduct had the intended effect of completely intimidating the Queen Regent. Shortly afterwards their leaders, who specially included the Earl of Glencairn, Lord Lorne, Erskine of Dun, and the Prior of S. Andrew's (afterwards the Regent Moray), wrote to John Knox inviting him to return to Scotland, as he could now do so in safety. The apostle lost no time in resigning his charge at Geneva, but when he arrived at Dieppe he received letters which so alarmed him that he refused to proceed. However, he wrote to the nobility calling upon them to accomplish the great work which they had begun,†

* Paul Methven was found guilty of abominable immorality. He did not appear in answer to a summons from the National Council of "the Scottish Church," held at the Blackfriars, Edinburgh, on 8th November, 1558.

† Tytler, Vol. V., p. 41. The fear of Knox was so great that it was not until 1559, and when he was assured of safety, that he ventured to go to Scotland.

and which he was afraid to go on with. The Lords, in reply, deplored their weakness, and drew up the celebrated Bond or Covenant dated 3rd December, 1557, in which they cursed their adversaries and denounced vengeance upon "the superstition, idolatry, and abominations of the Catholic Church." A resolution was also passed adopting the service book of Edward VI. for use in parish churches. They took both their liturgy and their bribes from England. The nobles sent emissaries throughout the country to spread calumnies against the doctrines of the Church and to foment tumults among the people. This was done under the pretext of correcting civil and ecclesiastical abuses. At the same time the Barons addressed the Queen Regent in a most insolent manner, demanding certain rights for congregations. They insisted particularly upon the vernacular tongue being used in the administration of the Sacraments. In truth they posed as the real rulers of the realm, although they were constitutionally but a part of the established power. One of their requests, evidently made for purposes of revolt, was that any lay person sufficiently learned should be allowed in churches to interpret obscure passages in the Scriptures. So glaringly ridiculous indeed is this liberty that it was not claimed by the most zealous Presbyterians after their system had been established under State authority. The Queen Regent temporised, threatened, ordered all to be ready to attend Mass and

profess their adherence to the liturgy, but all in vain. The nobles were too powerful. At last in 1559 "matters had ripened." Protestantism was espoused by not only the most powerful nobles but also by masses of people under their sway and influence. So strong had the party of revolution become that Knox at last considered it safe to return to Scotland. Accordingly, in compliance with a second invitation from the Lords of the Congregation, he arrived at Edinburgh in May, 1559.

At this point it is necessary to advert very specially to the character and conduct of the man who is indentified with the Reformation in Scotland. John Knox was its heart and soul. He was to Scotland what Luther was to Germany, and Calvin to Geneva.* To prove that this view is correct, and that a real challenge has been thrown down, I specially quote the following passage from one of the representative divines of Presbyterianism in Scotland. The Rev. D. Macleod, Chaplain to the Queen, says "To know John Knox is to know the Scotch Reformation; for he embodies at once the virtues and the faults which characterised the whole movement. It is no exaggeration to say that during the stirring period under review his voice was more powerful than

* "The history of this great Revolution in the history of the human mind is in Scotland connected almost exclusively with one extraordinary man—the intrepid (?) and unbending Knox." Tytler, Vol. V., p. 33.

that of the sovereign or any statesman.* He was preeminently patriot as well as preacher, statesman as well as ecclesiastic. . . . The Reformation certainly owed much to the great ability and statesmanship of the Regent Moray, but *Knox was its embodiment*. *We shall, therefore, deal with the Reformation and Knox as identical terms*, and speak of the Confession of Faith as Knox's own confession."† John Knox is confessedly the tree which produced the Reformation. Let us examine carefully whether this tree was bad or good, as we know well that a bad tree cannot produce good fruit.

John Knox was born in Scotland in 1505, studied at the University of S. Andrew, and was ordained priest before the year 1530. It was not until 1542 that he openly began to profess himself a Protestant. A few years afterwards he broke the solemn oath of celibacy he had taken, and was married at Berwick to a woman named Marjory Bowes.‡ We have already seen that Knox was

* Simply because he was backed by a nobility which comprised the power in the State. His audacity was always safe. Like most bullies he was a coward.

† *S. Giles's Lectures*. First Series. *Lecture on the Reformation*, by the Rev. D. Macleod, p. 129, W. and R. Chambers, 1880. The following nonsense is written by the chaplain to the Queen: "The duty of the Church was to make known what the Scripture taught, and *unless contrary Scripture could be shown* it was the duty of King and people to submit."

‡ With regard to leading facts in Knox's life see McCrie.

by his approval an accomplice in the murder of Cardinal Beaton.* He was taken with the other conspirators, carried to France, and there became a convict, and had to work at the galleys. He fled to England subsequently, and remained there several years as travelling missionary and chaplain to Edward VI. It was not convenient to him at the time to disbelieve in the Episcopacy, and Archbishop Cranmer, Grindal, and other "fathers of the English Reformation" † fully recognised the ordination of Knox and other foreign Calvinistic preachers. The only really necessary bond of union was determined hatred to the Catholic Church. Knox was certainly not a brave man. He fled from England some months after the accession of Mary, and remained safely on the Continent for nearly two years. Then in his anxiety to see his wife he returned secretly to Berwick, and penetrated very

Of this Biography Buckle remarks (Vol. III., p. 75), "It is to be regretted that no good life of Knox should have yet been published. That by McCrie is an undistinguishing and injudicious panegyric." Buckle says that Knox only helped on the Reformation when it was *safe* to do so, and the nobility had already virtually won the victory. This of course is true. See Buckle, Vol. III., p. 75.

* McCrie most disingenuously defends Knox, but even he says, "With more plausibility others have appealed to his writings as a proof that he vindicated the deed of the conspirators as laudable or at least innocent. Knox not only defended 'the Godly deed,' but spoke of it in a tone of levity and even of mockery."

† See McCrie.

quietly into Scotland, but danger again threatened and he again fled to Geneva (July, 1556). At last the Lords of the Congregation had really conquered, and his person was safe, so he came finally and permanently to Scotland in 1559. When on the Continent Knox enjoyed a considerable experience of public prisons, for we find that Calvin had to deliver him from the galleys of the Prior of Capua, to which he had been condemned for leading a grossly immoral life.* In a work by a contemporary (James Laing) we are distinctly informed that Knox, when a young man, was guilty of such grossly immoral conduct that his Bishop was forced to interfere and call him to account for these crimes. Then Knox became inflamed with hatred of the religion which censured him, and he became a Calvinist and a Reformer. Archibald Hamilton, Nichol Burne, James Laing, all Scotchmen, and all contemporaries of Knox,

* See the testimony of Theret, an ex-monk. The famous infidel Bayle rejects his testimony simply because he misspells Knox's name—rather excusable in a foreigner. Theret wrote regarding evident well-known facts of which the people of the time were aware. See Bayle's *Historical and Critical Dictionary—Article Knox*. Moreri charges Knox with serious crimes against chastity, and the Annalist Spendanus (A.D. 1559) says that "Knox, a priest, and an apostate monk, who was a debaucher of several women," caused tumults, sacrilege and violence in Scotland. Bayle himself says, "The misfortune is that the English Episcopalian writers agree with the Papist writers in representing him as an apostle who established his Reformation with fire and sword, 11 taught the most seditious doctrines."

agree in testifying to his notoriously bad character. Hamilton's book was published only five years after the death of Knox. We find this last mentioned writer stating the current belief and opinion respecting one of the scandalous crimes of which this Reformer was guilty. The word "putabatur" is used, which really means much more than a mere surmise, and yet McCrie makes out that the latter is the case. Indeed this prejudiced biographer, as well as other Presbyterian divines, seem to blind themselves in the most extraordinary and extravagant manner to evident proofs of the immorality, thorough untruthfulness, and completely seditious character of their hero. The absurd manner in which McCrie, the panegyrist of Knox, gets out of any difficulty is simply to take a high hand and deny everything. For instance his manner of refuting very definite and precise charges of gross immorality made by several contemporaries of Knox is to say, "But the two former writers were outstripped in calumny by that most impudent of all liars, James Laing. . . . There are few pages of his book in which he does not rail against our Reformer." Laing undoubtedly accuses Knox of heinous immoralities, and in this he only agrees with the other writers of that time. He states that Knox's hatred against the Church was induced by his Bishop having severely called him to account. Other authors tell us exactly the same thing. It is true that Laing may or may not have been im-

bued with “personal malice and religious rancour,” in which qualities Knox himself singularly excelled; but it is simple impudence “on the part of McCrie and his followers to dispose of these charges by merely contradicting them. We find three respectable Scotchmen publishing to the world, within nine years after the death of Knox, certain specific charges—not any vague generalities. They write strongly, it is true, and they may even appear to exaggerate, but it is rather absurd to suppose that, even for the sake of their own cause, they would boldly state complete falsehoods which could easily have been refuted while the events were fresh in every one’s mind. *Still more important, their statements have never been refuted.* It is true that McCrie tells us that Smeaton replied to Hamilton’s book, but most significantly he does not furnish us with this reply. If he repeated the facts, why are we not supplied with the refutation? As regards the other writers—exclusive of Hamilton—we hear of no refutation, except a simple denial from a man who lived hundreds of years afterwards.

In the year 1628, Father Alexander Baillie,* repeats as well known facts all the charges of gross immorality made against Knox by contemporaries. He definitely names places, persons

* “Baillie’s *True* information of the unhallowed offspring, progress and empoisoned fruits of our Scottish Calvinian Gospel and Gospellers,” p. 14-41. This book ought to be reprinted. Wirtsburgh, 1628.

and deeds. In reply, McCrie merely denies and attributes the charges to the personal asperities of the times. He says with more impudence than logic that "no honest and candid person" will fail to be in favour of his hero. The exact converse, however, is the case. No honest or candid person can fail to recognize the fact that there was a general combination of contemporaries against the character of Knox. They publicly denounced him as an abandoned profligate, specifying distinctly his crimes and the places where, and the persons with whom, they were committed. On the other hand his contemporary friends observed complete and ominous silence. Where are the *contemporary* answers to the charges of Hamilton, Laing, Baillie and others? We are, forsooth, to take the mere denials of prejudiced Presbyterian ministers who lived several centuries after the events. Not only is McCrie most prejudiced, he is also most uncandid. He styles a distinct averment of Hamilton to be a "malignant surmise," and calls a charge made against Knox which was hushed up and never disproved to be "a convicted lie." Knox was an accomplice and approver of murder in the case of Cardinal Beaton, and Tytler proves on most unexceptionable testimony that this apostle, identified with the Reformation, was one of the murderers of Rizzio.

CHAPTER IV.

Knox leads the plundering crusade against the Churches.—Robberies, violence, and destruction by the Reformers.—New covenant.—The Queen Regent's exertions.—Their failure.—Triumph of the Lords of the Reformation.—Treasonable and seditious proceedings.—Death of the Queen Regent.—Persecution of Catholicism.—Book of Discipline and Confession of Faith.—Death of Francis, husband of Mary.—The Queen invited to come across from France.—Elizabeth refuses a Passport.—Mary's reply.—Mary arrives in Scotland.

IT was with the help of the nobility and under their authority that Knox acted. The Lords of the Congregation thought it desirable to accompany their preachers, and it was with this object that the principal Barons of Angus and Mearns journeyed to Perth. Here Knox, knowing himself to be powerfully supported and perfectly safe, commenced the work of destruction. He began by preaching a very violent sermon against what he called idolatry.* This was evidently the concerted

* Nothing could be more false or disingenuous than the charge of idolatry. The great charge was against idolatry

signal for the work of destruction and spoliation, although with the absurd spirit of falsehood and humbug which masked the movement we are told that the mere sight of a priest coming out to celebrate Mass induced a youth to exclaim, "That this was intolerable. He appealed to those who stood by and conjured them not to permit that idolatry which God had condemned to be used in their despite and before their face."* The "rascal multitude," as Knox himself calls them, saw very clearly how they could please their masters and help themselves. The mob rushed to the houses of the Grey and Black friars, and in a few hours these edifices were thoroughly sacked. The Charterhouse, or Carthusian monastery met with the same fate, and within two days nothing but its bare walls were visible. Furniture, paintings, decorations, property of various descriptions, was either carried off or destroyed. Private property, for such it really was, received no more respect than the noble shrines and temples raised by such real Christians as S. Margaret, Malcolm, Alexander, and David. Knox, with his usual impudence, tells

in the Mass, but Dr. Johnson from his Protestant but honest point of view could see that such a charge is untenable, as Catholics really believe in the Real Presence. It is God they worship and Him alone. As regards sacred images the Church in Scotland in no way transgressed. It is merely a falsehood to say that Catholics at any time in Scotland worshipped images.

* MS. Colderwood, fol. 313, Vol. I. The sight of a priest coming out to say Mass must have been a very usual one.

us that "the spoil was permitted to the poor," and in the same breath informs us that "no honest man was enriched to the value of a groat." The truth is that the mob freely helped themselves, and that Knox as their leader was an accomplice in their robberies and violence. At Cupar similar excesses took place, and the crusade against property under the mask of religion had successfully commenced.

The Regent was extremely indignant when news arrived of the robberies and sacrileges which had been committed, and hastily gathering together all available forces, advanced towards Perth on 18th May, 1559. Letters of justification were now drawn up by the Protestants in which they declared their willingness to be loyal if they could live in peace and enjoy the free exercise of religion.* In an epistle specially addressed to the nobility it was alleged that a large portion of this order was on their side and that all that they had done was in obedience to God. "Our earnest and long request hath been, and yet is, that in open assembly it may be disputed, in presence of indifferent auditors, whether that these abominations named by the pestilent Papists religion, which they by fire and sword defend, be the true religion of Jesus Christ or not." The third letter was politely

* This was on the face of it "gross humbug," as they were now by far the stronger party and never permitted any toleration in religion. Exile, death, or imprisonment were the punishments for differing with them.

addressed “To the generation of anti-Christ, the pestilent prelates, and their shavelings within Scotland.” This was a very different epistle from that of S. Paul, or any of the apostles of the New Testament. It breathed fire, fury, and vengeance. It was veritably the epistle of John Knox, and only requires to be read in a careful manner to convince any impartial mind of the real character of this Reformation. If any opposition be offered to the new evangel, then a war of extermination, such as Israel carried on against the Canaanites, is to be adopted. The Reformers compose the congregation of Christ, and the Catholics are the offspring of the Man of Sin. The most extreme expressions of vengeance and wrath are united with the sacred name of God, and are given as an expression of the holy gospel of peace and love, preached by His Son.* The Queen Regent, in spite of all that had occurred, hated internecine strife and hoped yet for a peaceful solution of religious difficulties. A truce was agreed upon, the Reforming religion was tolerated, and controversies were to be reserved to Parliament. Before separating the Lords of the Congregation bound themselves together by a new covenant, which was signed by the Earls of Argyle and Glencairn, the Lord James, Lord Boyd, Lord

* Tytler is properly quite ashamed of it. He speaks of it as an epistle “which none can read without sorrow.” Vol. V., p. 62. Inconsistently enough, however, he cannot rise to the impartiality of denouncing its author, John Knox.

Ochiltree, and Mathew Campbell of Farning-hame.* According to the statements of Knox and other Reformers the Queen Regent did not attend to the spirit of the treaty, and this was made a convenient pretext by Argyle, Ruthven, Monteith and Murray of Tullibardine who declared that they were disgusted by her hypocrisy and tyranny. Certainly the latter was of a very mild character.

The Lords of the Congregation called a great meeting of their party to be held at St. Andrews on the 4th of June, and there Knox was duly in attendance. After sermons by this Apostle at Crail and Anstruther, the rascal multitude under Knox's guidance destroyed the altars and ecclesiastical furniture in these towns. At St. Andrews the Archbishop heard that his cathedral was to be reformed by being destroyed, and entered the town with a hundred spearsmen for the purpose of defending it. But Knox knew well that his own side was stronger, and when he was thoroughly aware of that fact, nothing could exceed his boldness and audacity. Accordingly he preached another inflammatory harangue, and then again became the tool of the Lords of the Congregation by destroying the noble buildings

* MS. Caldewood Vol. 1, p. 324. Protestant Authorities specially including these MS. Knox and Tytler are followed throughout so as really to show events according to the evidence of the Reformers themselves. Then even acknowledged letters, speeches and acts are sufficient to condemn them.

belonging to the Dominican and Franciscan orders. This work was of course a necessary preparation to their estates being seized upon by the reforming nobility in the name of the Gospel. The Queen Regent now assembled another army, but it was soon evident that Knox had calculated rightly. The nobility had triumphed against the well intentioned but weak woman who held the reins of authority.

Two armies encamped on Cupar Moor, one that of the Government, and the other that of the Lords of the Congregation, but the latter was so much more numerous that the Queen Regent was fearful of attacking it. The usual truce was then arranged. Perth was taken by the Congregation, on the 28th of June, and it was about this time that Knox wrote to the Court of Elizabeth for assistance from England. (The next great and venerable buildings to fall were the Palace Abbey of Scone, near Perth, which the mob principally out of desire for plunder, thoroughly destroyed in the cause of religious reformation. Argyle and the Lord James (afterwards the Regent Moray), subsequently advanced to Linlithgow, and after a good deal of destruction had been performed there they entered Edinburgh in triumph on the 29th of June 1559.

Although extremely sad to notice such detestable hypocrisy, it is somewhat amusing to read the language used by leaders of the Reformation. Kirkcaldy of Grange, one of the murderers of

Cardinal Beaton, eventually hanged at Edinburgh for treason to his own party, tells us that "presently they will take order throughout all the parts where they dwell that all the fruits of the abbeys and other churches shall be kept out and bestowed upon the faithful Ministers.* Knox writing to one of the representatives of the hereditary enemy of his country's liberties (England) says "Persuade yourself and assure others that we mean neither sedition, neither yet rebellion against any just and lawful authority, but only the advancement of Christ's religion." Cecil the astute Minister of Elizabeth, was in no way deceived. He perfectly understood the object of the Lords of the Congregation, and sends them distinct and clear advice not to neglect the opportunity now afforded them of striking the Romish Church of its pomps and wealth.† No doubt his Government considered that this might answer in lieu of his bribes in money, which was necessary in the reign of Henry VIII. Knox all this time was extremely busy plotting against the Government. He was the most useful tool the

* See Tytler Vol. V., p. 75. "The faithful Ministers," of course got nothing except £6 per annum each, and this was paid irregularly. John Knox was afterwards particularly indignant at not getting the pieces of silver earned by his treason.

† MS. letter, State Paper Office, 28th July, 1559. This letter is well worth perusal and will be found quoted by Tytler, Vol. V., p. 81.

nobility had ever used, and his unpayment after eventual success proves that in this case there was not even honour among thieves. Money was obtained eventually from England, which was the more wanted as Kirkcaldy of Grange, and several other Reformers were then in pecuniary distress. The poor Queen Regent did her best with some success to obtain reinforcements from France, and it is noticeable, that the Bishop of Amiens was sent as *Legate a latere* with two doctors of the Sorbonne to purge the Church and the people from heretical polemics.

The Lords of the Congregation had evidently a great deal to gain. It was now perfectly clear that they had an excellent chance of obtaining all the ecclesiastical revenues of Scotland, and we cannot therefore wonder either at the the accessions to their ranks, or at the character and conduct of those who joined them. Maitland of Lethington the secretary to the Queen Regent, saw well on which side his interest lay. He secretly adhered to the reformed doctrine, and proved himself a valuable adherent by traitorously remaining in the service of the Queen, and betraying all her secrets to her enemies. Open rebellion now took place. The farce of hearing Knox and Willoch on the subject of the religious duty of deposing the Queen Regent was performed by the Lords of the Congregation, and then they openly threw off her authority. On this subject Tytler says* that to

* Tytler, Vol. V., p. 105.

attempt to justify their proceedings under the allegation that they were born Councillors of the realm, was a specious but unsound pretence. Their birth entitled some of them to sit in Parliament, but could never bestow upon them the power to constitute themselves a self-elected council, without the intervention of the royal authority, or any meeting of the three estates. After this came a crisis. Money ran short, and the soldiers of the Congregation broke into mutiny, demanded their pay, and offered their services to any Catholic or Protestant master who would pay them.* Elizabeth, at the earnest entreaties of Cecil, then sent £4,000, but one of the reformers (the Earl of Bothwell) waylaid the messenger and seized the money.† Disasters attended the cause of the Congregation, and it is very significant that when their forces were compelled to retreat from Edinburgh, which was considered their chief stronghold, "they retreated amid the shouts and insults of a great proportion of the citizens."‡ At this juncture Knox exerted himself to the utmost and proved himself a most useful tool. At a meeting of leaders where he opened the proceedings with prayer, it was recognized that they were really

* Tytler, Vol. V., p. 105.

† The action was the more treacherous as Bothwell was at the time in secret correspondence with the Reformers, and had professed attachment to the cause.—Tytler, Vol. V., p. 106.

‡ Tytler, Vol. V., p. 106.

unable to keep the field, and must trust their cause to the assistance of Elizabeth, to whom Maitland of Lethington was sent. To show the tortuous and dishonest expedients which Knox did not scruple to adopt, we find him at this time suggesting that one thousand English troops should be sent to their assistance, as it was free for English subjects to serve any leader who paid their wages. If this were questioned he recommended that Elizabeth should first send the auxiliaries into Scotland and then declare them rebels, after they embraced the service of the Congregation.* The mean and despicable manner in which the Reformers sought the help of England is only equalled by the contemptible dissimulation of Elizabeth, who pretended to be a friend of the very Government she was plotting to destroy. Even Tytler is forced to speak of the somewhat mortifying “view of the early Reformers, when we find that after all the solemn warnings denounced against trusting too exclusively to an arm of flesh, Knox consented to purchase the co-operation of mere human power by omitting all allusion to that great cause of religious reformation which they had so repeatedly represented as the paramount object for which they had taken up arms and now were ready to sacrifice their lives.”† When an English fleet entered the Frith of Forth it was most dishonestly declared that they had

* Keith, Appendix, pp. 39, 40, 41.

† Tytler, Vol. V., p. 112.

merely gone to sea to look for pirates, and Queen Elizabeth solemnly declared that she respected the treaties and thought of nothing less than war. Shortly afterwards a French army was sent to invade Scotland, and de Winter opened a cannonade from the fleet. An attack was made on Edinburgh, and the French soldiers gained a victory. Another success was obtained shortly afterwards, and the Lords of the Congregation then thought it desirable to negotiate. The Regent was now worn out with anxiety and trouble and became so ill that her life was despaired of. She sent for the leaders of the Reformation in Edinburgh, and in the most earnest manner desired them to get rid both of the French and English soldiers, and unite their best efforts for the welfare of Scotland. She spoke with the utmost charity and kindness, so as to affect many of these turbulent men to tears, begged pardon for all her offences, and said farewell affectionately to each individual. She was not allowed the liberty of dying in peace, but was grossly attacked by a Minister named Wallach, who called upon her to renounce the abomination of the Mass as a relic of Idolatry. This Princess of the House of Guise did not answer this insult by any reproach, but heard him uncomplainingly and without reply. She died as she had lived, in the Catholic Faith, to the preservation of which she had devoted her best energies. "Done to death by traitors" would have been a suitable inscription on the tomb of this Princess, who had uniformly endeavoured to do

her duty by sustaining the cause of lawful authority and of the Church of God.

A treaty was now entered into between England and the French leaders in Edinburgh, by means of which the Lords of the Congregation were protected by an act of oblivion. Redress was to be given to Bishops and other Churchmen who had received injury, and no man was to molest them in the collection of their revenues. This latter stipulation was of course only made to be broken, as the object of the real leaders of the Reformation was merely plunder under the cloak of religion. The French army four thousand strong then left Scotland. A packed Parliament under the chairmanship of Maitland of Lethington was soon afterwards held (1560) when the favourers of liberty of religion denounced the doctrines of the Catholic Church in the most calumnious manner, and styled the Bishops and clergy of the Church "thieves, murderers, rebels, and traitors." The Reformers now had the upper hand, and resolved upon the robbery and oppression of the Catholics. Knox inveighed like a man possessed with an evil spirit inculcating hatred, revenge, spoliation, and persecution. So far from liberty of conscience being permitted, it was only allowed to Protestants. A Confession of Faith was drawn up, revised, and adopted. The Catholics were bullied in the most violent manner; the Duke de Chastelherault going so far as to threaten his brother the Archbishop of St. Andrews with death if he dared

to oppose these proceedings. It is mere mockery to call such an assembly a Parliament where there was neither freedom nor even the pretence of freedom. The Church robbers had the nation by the throat and determined, if necessary, to retain by violence what they had acquired by violence. Knox was merely treated with contemptuous indifference when he demanded a share of the spoil for himself, and the other Ministers. They had been willing and useful tools, but the nobles could now do without them, and while they still profited by their calumnies and exertions determined to keep the plunder to themselves. The Protestant religion was ostensibly established to give men liberty of conscience, but under the new confession or standard it was distinctly provided that all who said Mass, or heard Mass, should for the first transgression be punished with confiscation of goods; for the second incur the penalty of banishment from the kingdom; and if guilty of a third offence be put to death*. The Confession of Faith was followed by the Book of Discipline for the Government of Protestantism in Scotland. The treaty entered into at Berwick between the Lords of the Congregation and Elizabeth was confirmed,

* Tytler, Vol. V., p. 143. So full of hatred were the Scottish Reformers to all Bishops—even Protestant ones—that Goodman, an active preacher under the Congregation, exhorting them not to suffer “the bloody Bishops” in England to live. This was the tone of the preachers of the new Gospel of Jesus Christ.

and a selection of twenty-four members was made, out of which a Supreme Governing Council of twelve was to be chosen. The former comprised the Duke de Chastelherault, the Earl of Arran, the Earls of Huntley, Argyle, Glencairn, Morton, Athol, Menteith, Marshall, and Rothes. The Lords James, Erskine, Ruthven, Lindsay, Boyd, Ogilvy, St. John, and the Master of Maxwell; the Lairds of Limdy, Pitcarron, Dim, Cunningham Head, Drumlanrig, and young Lethington. Suit was also to be made that the Queen of England should join in marriage with the Earl of Arran. An Ambassador was sent to the court of France and to the Queen of Scotland at that court, but we cannot wonder that he was received with extreme coldness. As Tytler aptly states the Congregation "had overturned the established religion and let loose against all who ventured to adhere to the belief of their fathers the fury of religious persecution; and they had entered into a league with another kingdom; and as if conscious of the illegal nature of their proceedings had attempted to protect themselves against the punishment of the laws by giving a pretended parliamentary sanction to the most violent of their measures.* The young French King, Francis

* Tytler, Vol. V., p. 150. At this time "so completely were English interests predominant in the assembly of the estates, that Lethington and Moray, in all important measures, received the advice of Elizabeth and her Ministers." "I will tell you frankly," said the Cardinal of Lorraine to the English Ambassador in France, "the Scots, the King's sub-

the Second, husband of Mary Queen of Scots, died at Orleans on the sixth of December 1560. Throckmorton the English Ambassador who was present at the Court of France describes the behaviour of Mary, in the most favourable manner, and writes specially of "her wisdom and queenly modesty." The Congregation in Scotland exulted openly at this calamity, and Knox gloating over the news declared that "as the King sat at Mass he was struck by an imposthume in that deaf ear which would never hear the word of God, when his glory perished, and the pride of his stubborn heart vanished in smoke."*

The Lord James afterwards Earl of Moray was a natural son of James the Fifth and therefore a blood relation of the Queen of Scotland. He was remarkable for personal bravery and great intellectual ability, coupled with complete unscrupulousness and want of principle. As one of the leading Lords of the Congregation he had with the others acquired considerable wealth by the change of religion. He and his colleagues were the real rulers of Scotland, and their chief object was to prevent any alteration in the Government, which would result in their having to give back and disgorge the estates and wealth they had acquired by Church robbery. As a means to this
jects, do perform no part of their duties; the King and the Queen have the name of their Sovereigns, and your mistress hath the effect and the obedience."

* Knox, p. 280.

end they were closely leagued with Elizabeth, and employed Knox and other Ministers to go on thundering out calumnious denunciations against Catholics and the Catholic Church. They considered however that if unaccompanied by any French force it would be quite safe for them if Mary came to rule in Scotland. She was accordingly invited to cross over and assume the personal Government of the Kingdom. Previously Mary had announced complete oblivion and forgiveness for all offences, and had declared that she had declined offers of marriage from the Prince of Spain, and the Kings of Sweden and Denmark. She had resolved to entertain none of these proposals till she could in person consult her nobles, and receive the assent of her people. The Earl of Moray was the special envoy chosen by the Congregation to invite Mary to her own country, and the young Queen would never have placed confidence in him if she had been aware that he had already made Elizabeth and Cecil participants in his intentions "and that nothing was to be done in Scottish matters without consulting the English Queen."* After having taken leave of Mary he met the English Ambassador and insidiously informed him of everything that had taken place.†

* Tytler, Vol V., p. 176.

† In a letter from Throckmorton to Elizabeth, he earnestly urges the desirability of keeping the Lords of the Congregation in the pay of England, although it should cost £20,000 per annum.

Mary declared her intention to return to Scotland, and applied for a passport to Elizabeth, which was at once refused with rudeness. Secret orders were also given to intercept the Queen of Scotland, and the baseness and treachery of Moray, and the Protestant party in Scotland were displayed by their hearty accord with Elizabeth at this time.* Mary behaved with prudence, dignity and spirit. Addressing Throckmorton, she said, "Monsieur l'Ambassadeur, it doth more grieve me than that I did so forget myself as to require of the Queen, your mistress, that favour which I had no need to ask. I needed no more to have made her privy of my journey, than she doth me of hers. I may pass well enough home into my own realm I think without her passport or license; for although the late King, your master, used all the impeachment he could both to stay me, and catch me, when I came hither, yet you know I came hither safely; and I may have as good means to help me home again, as I had to come hither, if I would employ my friends. . . . It seemeth that your mistress maketh more account of the amity of my disobedient subjects, than she doth of me their sovereign, who am her equal in degree, though inferior in wisdom and experience, her nighest

* See the MS. letters in the *States Papers* office quoted by Tytler Vol. V., p. 188. One of these, speaking of her possible capture, states "*this proceeding will like the Scots well.*"

kinswoman and her next neighbour. I ask of her nothing but friendship ; I do not trouble her State, nor practise with her subjects. And yet I know there be in her realm, some that be inclined enough to hear offers. I know also, they be not of the same mind she is of, neither in religion nor in other things. The Queen, your mistress, doth say that I am young, and do lack experience ; but I have age enough and experience to behave myself towards my friends and kinsfolks friendly and uprightly ; and I trust my discretion shall not so fail me, that my passion shall move me to use other language of her than is due to a Queen, and my next kinswoman."

Mary left Paris on the 21st of July, 1560, and embarked at Calais, for Scotland, on the 14th of August. All that day she scarcely turned her eyes from the beloved country in which she had spent her youth. There was a calm during the night, and on the next morning the coast of France was still visible. Straining her eyes, she gazed upon this coast until the shores on which she had passed the happiest years of her life faded from vision. "Farewell France," said she, "Beloved France, I shall never see thee more." A favourable wind sprung up and a fog accompanied it. The first quickly wafted Mary to her destination, while the thick sea mists so effectually obscured the ship of the young Queen from the English fleet, as to save her from capture. Her time had not yet come. . .

CHAPTER V.

Mary arrives in Scotland.—Her persecution for Catholicism commences.—Insolence of Knox.—Disappointment of the Ministers in not getting their share of plunder.—Violence of Knox.—Mary's conduct towards Elizabeth and the Reformers.—Persecution of Catholics.—Moray in Supreme power.—Mary's conduct as a Catholic Queen.—Her mistakes.—“The end justifies the means,” the motto of the Reformers.—Murder of Riccio.—Knox one of the assassins.—Conduct of the Queen.

MARY was received with great joy by all classes of her servants, but it soon became evident that it was considered too dangerous to allow her that liberty of opinion in matters of faith for which the Reformation was nominally established. John Knox acted like a mad Dervish, and poured forth torrents of abuse against “the idolatrous mass.” The Reforming nobility virtually ruled the country and left to Knox the chief management of the fanatical department. Fanaticism was their means to an end—their secure possession of church property. Of course streams of calumnies and invec-

tives approved of by the superior classes told powerfully upon the ignorant and impressionable people. One holy zealot, assisted by a number of armed men, rushed into the Court of the Queen's Palace, for the purpose of murdering the priests, and was only prevented from performing this act of piety, by the intervention of the Lord James, who had personally to stand at the chapel door and thus preserve the lives of the Queen's Chaplains. Knox was extremely wrath, and attacked Moray violently for having dared to interfere, and distinctly declared in favor of the attempt to murder.* At this time the Queen published a proclamation notifying her determination to maintain the Protestant form of worship which she had found established. There was, therefore, not the shadow of excuse for the horrible and vindictive manner in which she herself was persecuted. The dreadful fear of having to give up their illgotten gains, urged the nobility, however, to encourage the ignorant fanaticism of Knox and his "rascal multitude." Mary having sent for the great apostle, calmly and reasonably endeavoured to show him the necessity of treating people who differed from him with greater charity. But Knox replied in such a rude and violent manner, as to cause the Queen to shed tears. Nothing could surpass the insolence of his invectives and gesticulations—indeed generally his conduct was more that of a malicious madman, than of a reasonable being. In an argument

* See Knox's *History of the Reformation* p. 306.

which took place on this occasion, Mary had incomparably the advantage. Knox contended that in religion, subjects were bound to follow, not the will of their Prince, but the commands of their Creator. "If," said he, "all men in the days of the Apostles should have been compelled to follow the religion of the Roman Emperors, where would have been the Christian faith? Daniel and his fellows were subjects to Nebuchodonosor and Darius, and yet they refused to be of their religion." "But," interrupted the Queen, "these men did not resist." "And yet," replied Knox, "they who obey not the commandment may virtually be said to resist. "Nay," rejoined Mary, "They did not resist with the sword." "That," said Knox, "was simply because they had not the power." Here he was telling a glaring falsehood.* But Mary saw behind the veil of this untruth, that the principles of the Reformation in Scotland, and of rebellion to all lawful authority, went hand in hand. Then in a rhapsody, as irrational, as it was insolent, he spoke of subjects having the right to take the sceptre from Princes who persecuted the children of God—forgetting that the early Christians, and the apostle S. Paul, were clearly of a different opinion, and that Mary had distinctly by law accorded full toleration.

* It is well known that the early Christians were not allowed to resist, even Pagan authorities, but were enjoined to obey them, not for fear, but for conscience sake. See on this subject *S. Paul to the Romans*, Chap., XIII.

The Reformation was now fully established, but the Ministers were cheated of their share in the plunder, and were naturally most indignant. They had performed the important work of poisoning “the rascal multitude” with calumnies against the doctrines of the Catholic Church, while they hounded them on to the destruction of the churches and monasteries, as well as to the persecution of those people who dared to adhere to the faith of their fathers. But they had positively received nothing. The General Assembly of the Kirk demanded a share for the Ministers; but this was resisted by many of the Barons who had been most zealous promoters of the Reformation, and who we are told “loved its plunder better than its principles.” “Lethington, learned, acute, and worldly, openly scoffed,” and Knox, who was no match in argument, had recourse to his usual weapon—violent abuse. At last, after terrible struggles, a share was allotted to Ministers in the same way that, after the feast, a banquetter may throw a bone to a dog. The bone in this case had very little meat on it, as it was asserted “that the only effect of the change was to secure a large share for the lay proprietors of church lands, to transfer a considerable portion to the crown, and to leave a wretched pittance for the Ministers.”* Knox was dreadfully enraged at this arrangement, and his passion was further inflamed by permission being given for Mass to be said in the

* Tytler, Vol. V., p. 209.

Queen's chapel, while sanction was refused to a proposed Book of Discipline. This last was a code of law in which was sketched out a system of outrageous tyranny. The Ministers were to be the absolute rulers of the people and woe to any one who dared to oppose their orders.* As to the character of these men, even Randolph, the English Protestant Ambassador, was forced to say, "to be plain with your Honour, our preachers be more vehement than discreet or learned, which I heartily lament." These ignorant men, like the blind leading the blind, continually misrepresented the doctrines of the Church. Books were few and dear—education was necessarily not widely spread; the nobles were thoroughly interested in supporting the new religion, and as a result poor Scotland was sacrificed. Nothing has more tended to spread heresy than falsehood and ignorance. The calumnies of 1582 are impossible in 1882. A free press, cheap literature, and above all things the spread of education, have hewed down the intolerant tyranny of Presbyterianism and enabled men to see that if Christianity be true the only logically possible Christian Church is the Catholic.

The Lord James, now created Earl of Mar, had

* See Buckle's *History of Civilization in England*, Vol. III., for full proof of the terrible grinding tyranny of the Presbyterian Ministers. As a punishment no doubt for heresy, the country was cursed by this narrow Calvinistic tyranny for more than two centuries.

really the reins of State in his hands. The Earl of Arran felt his displacement from power so much that his mind became deranged, and he informed the Queen of a conspiracy against her participated in by his father—the Duke de Chastelherault. Mary behaved with the greatest tenderness and forbearance, and Rudolphi gives in his letters to Elizabeth a touching picture of her gentleness, justice and impartiality ; at the same time, with that uprightness and honesty, which characterised her nature, the Scottish Queen discouraged every intrigue on the part of English Catholics against Elizabeth. So far from countenancing them, or affording them the least support, she invariably assisted to the best of her ability in their detection and punishment.* At this time a Catholic Bishop was sent as a special messenger from the Pope to the Queen. His visit was necessarily private, and so violent was the intolerance of the Reformers, that when it became known that a papal envoy had visited the palace, every effort was made to capture him in order that he might be put to death. In fact, we are assured that he was saved only in consequence of a peremptory remonstrance from the Earl of Mar.† This nobleman had

* Tytler, Vol. V., p. 215. This was in striking contrast to Elizabeth's uniform conduct towards her—invariably marked by jealousy and treachery.

† This envoy—styled “a Jesuit,” was nearly discovered during his interview with the Queen. The four Maries assisted strenuously in preventing his capture.

thoroughly succeeded in gratiating himself with the Queen, and under his influence as well, no doubt, as from general ideas of polity, Protestantism was thoroughly favoured. So much so, indeed, was this the case that the Catholic Earl of Huntley seems to have been goaded into a rebellion, in which he was slain with a number of his retainers by troops under the direction of the Earl of Mar. This astute and unscrupulous Statesman was as avaricious as he was ambitious. Not content with the extensive Church property he had already acquired, and the money he had obtained from England by means of treachery, he now coveted and obtained the extensive estates attached to the Farldom of Moray. Everything favoured that portion of the nobility of Scotland under whose auspices, and for whose purposes, the Reformation was prosecuted. The young Queen was deluded into believing others as honest as herself, and full of ingenuous trust in her half-brother —now Earl of Moray—was evidently determined not to allow her religious convictions to interfere with her supposed duties as a sovereign. In the meantime, Presbyterianism, receiving no check, gained ground in every direction, and with it a system of seditious disaffection arose against legitimate authority. Randolph in his letters to Cecil tells us that the preachers pray that “God will either turn the heart of the Queen or send her short life,” and ironically adds, “of what charity or spirit this proceedeth I leave to be discussed by

the great Divines.”* The insolence of Knox went beyond all bounds. Some festivities, including dancing, had taken place at the palace, which formed a subject for a discourse from this new apostle, in which, after referring specially to John the Baptist having been beheaded “to reward the dancing of a harlot’s daughter,” he proceeded to inveigh against the shameful manner in which Princes abuse their authority, and stated that the devil had taken possession of the throne. “But how can it be otherwise? For Princes will not understand, they will not be learned as God commands them; but they despise God’s law. For in fiddling and flinging they are more exercised than in reading or hearing God’s most blessed word, and fiddlers and flatterers are more precious in their eyes than men of wisdom and gravity.”†

Encouraged by the Bishop of S. Andrew’s, and the Prior of Whithem, Mass was celebrated secretly in many private houses, but this was soon found to be dangerous, and Catholics had to flee to the woods and mountains in order to worship God according to their conscience. This cruel

* MS., letter State Paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 28th February 1562-3.

† Even Randolph, a Protestant Ambassador from a Protestant sovereign, pronounced the violence and suspicions of Knox, to be unreasonable. His hypocrisy was even greater than his ruffianism. He was a man of immoral life, seditious, proud and an accessory in murder.

persecution was specially furthered by Knox who took it upon himself to declare that subjects should take the law into their own hands against Catholics if the civil power failed to do so. Priests were seized and punished, while the Archbishop of S. Andrews, the Prior of Whithern, the Rector of Sanguhen, and other ecclesiastics, were imprisoned for the heinous crime of saying Mass. Shortly after this, John Knox endeavoured to get a tyrannical sumptuary law passed interfering with the dress of the ladies of the Queen's Court. Moray, however, was above such petty despotism and would not tolerate it, upon which Knox turned upon him in a most spiteful manner and vented one of his malicious prophecies. "If you decay," he said, "as I fear ye shall, then call to mind by what means The Most High exalted you." Shortly afterwards he ventured on another spiteful reference to future events when speaking of the possible marriage of the Queen, he cried out, "Note the day and bear witness hereafter whenever the nobility of Scotland who profess the Lord Jesus, consent that an infidel (and all Papists are infidels) shall be head to our sovereign, ye do as far as in you lieth, to banish Christ Jesus from this realm, and to bring God's vengeance on the country." The impertinence with which the Ruler and the Council of the Realm, were attacked under the cloak of religion called forth the indignation of both Catholics and Protestants * The

* Knox, p. 359. "These words," Knox himself says,

Reformer, in spite of his rough blunt outspoken ways, was at this time in treacherous correspondence with Cecil,* the Minister of Elizabeth, to whom he betrayed political secrets, and from whom no doubt he received a pension. The malignity with which he endeavoured to injure his enemies made him a dangerous man, and at this time he had acquired so leading a position as the apostle of the new faith as to secure him a prominent part in the Government of the country..

Protracted negotiations with Elizabeth, in which she urged upon Mary the desirability of her marrying the Earl of Leicester, were accompanied by promises and assurances of friendship, as false and deceitful as it is possible to conceive. At last the mask of pretended amity fell, and the Queen of Scotland perceived that she had been merely fooled by a jealous and implacable rival.† A “and this manner of speaking was judged intolerable. Papists and Protestants were both offended.”

* MS. letter State Paper Office, Knox to Cecil, 6th October 1563.

† Tytler says, “ Are we to wonder that when she suddenly was awakened to the duplicity with which she had been treated—when in a moment the mask of pretended amity and affection, so long worn by the English Queen, fell to the ground, and the features of fraud, falsehood and selfishness, came out in all their deformity, Mary recoiled with mortification and disgust ? Her confidence had been abused ; she was the dupe of successful artifice ; she might soon be the victim of intrigues of which she knew not the ramifications and extent.” Tytler Vol. V., p. 277.

general review of the history of this period, shows Mary as a too amiable sovereign, trusting blindly to her inveterate enemies, both at home and in England. Unfortunately, her chief adviser was an arch villain, who was bound to the cause of the Reformation, as it meant the secure possession by himself of great wealth and of great power. The Lords of the Congregation dared not permit the Catholic Church to exist in Scotland, and with this paramount object in view, they were urged by powerful reasons to encourage John Knox and the other zealots. In every great movement of this character there are knaves and fools. The Reforming nobles certainly can be classed in the former category and the deluded and ignorant people, with many of their Ministers, in the latter. So able and unscrupulous was the Queen's natural brother (Moray), that there is great reason to believe he goaded the Catholics, under the Earl of Huntley, into rebellion, and then profited by it. Certain it is that the unfortunate Queen of Scots was from the first in the hands of malignant enemies and traitors. Her only plan of safety was to obtain the aid of France, declare in favour of the Catholic Church, in which she conscientiously believed, and oppose the plunder of that Church and of the poor which was effected under the transparent veil of religion. Her lot was cast with the enemies of her faith, and she became in some ways a participator in their guilt. Hence all her misfortunes. Even previous to her foolish

marriage with Darnley, she might have extricated herself by a union with the King of France, or with one of those European Princes who sought her hand. But it was not to be. The beautiful young Queen had no experienced and wise adviser upon whom she could rely. Placing entire confidence in her natural brother, the Earl of Moray, she was merely used—as he used every one with whom he came in contact—as a tool for the gratification of his avarice and ambition. She thought to be able to act honestly a double part, but was mistaken. Two masters cannot be served. Either she was bound for her own temporal interests heartily to join the cause of the Reformation as Elizabeth did, or heartily to oppose it. She did neither, and between the two causes fell a victim. Her faults and her misfortunes are so inextricably woven together it is difficult to separate them. Certain it is that in this world she expiated for them all, and at last died nobly on the scaffold for the faith which she had always firmly professed.

Mary passed the rubicon when she married a Scottish nobleman. From that day her fate was sealed. Darnley was unfortunately only nineteen years of age and a fool. He soon became proud, overbearing and insolent to the nobility, and above all, made the terrible mistake of enlisting Moray among his enemies. It soon was whispered that he must either change his conduct or lose his life.*

* Randolph to Cecil, 20th March 1564-5, printed in Keith,

The opposition of Elizabeth, the head of the Reformation and Church in England, to the marriage of Mary with Darnley, was extremely embittered, and one reason can be found in an important minute written by Cecil. When speaking of danger to the realm from Catholic influences, the statesman pointedly remarks that "it was to be remembered how of late in the perusing of the relations of the Justices of the Peace, in all counties of the realm, scantily a third part was found fully assured to be trusted in the matter of religion, upon which only string the Queen of Scots title doth hang." We will see in due course that the murder of Darnley, like the murder of Beaton, was an act of the Reformers. That the end justifies the means is a proposition anathematised by the Catholic Church, and condemned by all right thinking men. But it was acted upon

p. 274. Elizabeth, Moray and the Reformers all detested the marriage, and heartily opposed it. Mary sent out special secret instructions. Beaton, her messenger, was met by her Ambassador, Lethington, one of the principal Reformers. Tytler says, Vol. V., p. 293, "Nothing can more strikingly show the treachery of Mary's Ministers, and the entire licence they assumed of disobeying, when it was convenient for them, the commands of their Sovereign, than Lethington's conduct on this occasion. He heard the message, afterwards joined Throckmorton, the English Ambassador, and then basely communicated to him the secret instructions he had received. . . . Are we to wonder that when Mary's affairs were managed by such men, she was anxious to change her counsellors." Unfortunately, as regards treachery, all the leading Reformers were alike.

by Knox and his co-Reformers. We shall soon find this apostle a *particeps criminis*, in the murder of Rizzio; and it was zealots of the same Presbyterian and Reforming type who many years afterwards thought that they were doing the work of God when they cruelly murdered the Protestant Archbishop of S. Andrew's in the presence of his defenceless daughter. Mary committed a terrible mistake in underrating the Catholic power in Scotland, allying herself with its deadly enemies,* by permitting the persecution of its profession. The marriage with Darnley, was a headstrong act of folly which precipitated her doom.

Even before the marriage, the Protestants, under Moray and Argyle, debated among themselves whether or not they should assassinate Darnley or deliver him to England.† Rudolph writes to Cecil. "My Lord of Moray liveth where he lests. . . . David (Rizzio, French Secretary) is he that now worketh all, Chief Secretary to the Queen, and only governor to her good man. . . . The bruits here are wonderful, men talk very strange, the hazard towards him and his

* So far did Mary favour Protestantism, that Elizabeth's agent, Randolph, described the Protestants as contented, excepting the most violent, whom he censures. Moray and Lethington assured their real mistress—Elizabeth—that the conduct of the Queen of Scots, in respect to the reformed religion entitled her to high praise. They enjoyed liberty of conscience and the favour of their Prince. See Tytler, Vol. V., p. 300.

† See Tytler, Vol. V., p. 301.

house marvellous great. . . . They find nothing but that God must send him a short end, or themselves a miserable life. Only to remedy this mischief he (Darnley), must be taken away. What for the Queen's Majesty (Elizabeth) if she list not to do it by force, with the expense of three or four thousand pounds, to do with this country what she would."* Moray threw off all authority and entered upon an open rebellion, which was ignominiously defeated. Mary, at this time, joined the powerful league entered into between France, Spain and the Emperor, and it seemed as if there was once more hope for justice and the Catholic Faith in Scotland. No sooner was this done than Moray and his associates determined upon desperate measures, including the murder of Rizzio, who was looked upon as an able statesmen devoted to the Court of Rome. Strange to say, this assassination was also planned by the Queen's weak, miserable husband on absurd grounds of jealousy and hatred. Darnley then entered into an unnatural league with Moray, Morton, Ruthven, John Knox, and the other Protestant leaders. The Reformers were aware that Mary had signed "the Popish league," and it was believed that Rizzio corresponded with Rome. It was, therefore, feared that measures were in preparation for the restoration of the Catholic Faith in Scotland. All the Ministers of Edinburgh, specially including

* MS. letter State Paper office, Randolph to Leicester, 3rd June 1565.

Knox, and Craig were made aware of the conspiracy, whose special objects were to assassinate Rizzio, imprison the Queen, entrust Darnley with nominal sovereignty and replace the real management of affairs in the hands of Moray. Tytler tells us that "desperate as were these designs the reformed party in Scotland did not hesitate to adopt them."^{*} The usual "solemn league and covenant," was entered into which included the accustomed formula about upholding the Protestant religion, and maintaining every reform founded upon the word of God. Elizabeth knew and approved of the plot.[†]

Knox prepared the public mind for the foul murder by select quotations from the old testament. He descanted specially upon the hanging of Haman, the slaughter of Oreb and Zeeb, and the massacre of the Benjamites. On the evening of Saturday 6th of March, 1565, Mary was at supper in a small room, when suddenly an armed force of more than one hundred men occupied the court of the palace of Holyrood, seized upon the gates, and took possession of the building. The conspirators were admitted without delay into the

* Tytler, Vol. V., p. 236.

† For proof of this see Tytler, Vol. V., pp. 341-3. It is a curious circumstance that shortly before his assassination, Rizzio received a mysterious caution from an astrologer named Damiot, telling him "*to be aware of the bastard*," alluding to George Douglas, natural son of the Earl of Angus, or to Moray, who was really the prime conspirator.

King's apartment, which communicated by a narrow stair with the room in which the Queen was at supper. Darnley at once ascended, threw up the arras which concealed an opening in the wall, entered the small apartment where Mary was seated, put his arm affectionately round her waist and seated himself at table. Those present with the Queen, were the countess of Argyle, the Commendator of Holyrood, Beaton, Master of the Household, Arthur Erskine, Captain of the Guard, and Secretary Rizzio. In a minute afterwards, the appalling figure of Ruthven, clad in complete armour, and looking cadaverous from recent illness, came like a death's head into the apartment. Then the unfortunate Queen knew that some deed of violence was imminent, and although little able, being *enceinte*, to bear any excitement, called out to Ruthven in a loud voice to begone. But no sooner had she spoken than a confused number of voices and weapons were heard, and Kerr of Fandonside, George Douglas and other conspirators rushed forward. Ruthven endeavoured to seize Rizzio, and with dagger in hand, pursued him to the side of Mary, when holding her gown, the unfortunate man called out for justice and for the Queen to save his life. But the Queen was powerless against these ruffians. Deaf to her prayers and entreaties, they overturned the table and the lights, while they performed their dastardly deed by the fitful gleam of torches. Shrieking with terror and bleeding from dagger wounds, Rizzio was

torn from the knees of the Queen, to which he clung in anguish, and dragged with execrations through the Queen's bedroom to the entrance of the presence chamber. There the Reformers rushed like wolves upon this one defenceless man, mangled his body with no fewer than fifty-six wounds, and left his corpse in a pool of blood, whose stain will never be removed from the memory of John Knox and the Reformers of Scotland. This was all done in the name of the God of charity, justice and love, and for the sake of religion! The brutal Ruthven threw himself down on a couch in the Queen's apartment, and told Mary her husband had advised this murder. Next day she found herself a prisoner in the hands of a band of Reforming assassins. The conspirators then resolved to shut up their Sovereign in Stirling Castle,* to give up the Government to Darnley, and to strengthen themselves in the possession of church property by confirming the Protestant religion under the penalty of death or perpetual imprisonment. But the Queen acted with judgment and bravery. She gained over the contemptible Darnley, who denied all complicity in the plot again Rizzio, and she managed to escape to Dunbar, where Huntley and other nobles joined her.

That John Knox was one of those who con-

* Tytler says that we may gather from Randolph that their intentions if she resisted their wishes, vacillated between murder and perpetual captivity, Vol. V., p. 350.

spired to murder Rizzio, was privy to the design, and approved of it, has been satisfactorily established. In accordance with the usual method of explaining away and excusing every bad, wicked act of the Reformer which cannot be brazenly denied, McCrie (the biographer of Knox) tells us "That there is no reason to think that he was privy to the conspiracy which proved fatal to Rizzio; but it is *probable** that he had expressed his satisfaction at an event which contributed to the safety of religion and of the commonwealth, if not also his approbation of the conduct of the conspirators."† Tytler, in his history of Scotland, becomes an unwilling witness against the Reformer, and is forced to say that on an examination of letters in the State Paper Office, from which he gives copious quotations,‡ the inference is inevitable "that in an authentic list sent to Secretary Cecil by Bedford and Randolph, the name of John Knox is given as one of those who were privy and consenting to the death of David Rizzio." He goes on with his proof, and concludes by saying that "The evidence therefore is direct and clear, and comes from those who must be esteemed the best witnesses in such a case." But John Knox was able to do anything.

* McCrie knew perfectly well that he had done so, but is too much of a sophist and partisan to state the truth boldly, but uses the word "*probably*."

† McCrie's *Life of Knox*, p. 253.

‡ See Tytler, Vol V., *Appendix*, p. 498-507.

Immoral conduct, destruction of property, robbery, vulgar ruffianism, even murder, are all to be smoothed over because of his deadly hatred to the Catholic Church, and of his successful revolt against its doctrines and teaching. Although calling himself a Minister of the Gospel of the God of love and charity, he became a willing, eager accessory in the murder of a poor foreigner who clung in vain to the skirts of the Queen, calling aloud for that justice and mercy which were denied him by his cruel murderers. This is the man that has been uniformly lauded, and is now highly praised as the embodiment of the Scottish Reformation.*

* “To know John Knox is to know the Scottish Reformation.” Rev. D. Macleod, Chaplain to the Queen, in *S. Giles's Lectures*, First Series, p. 129. Tytler is strangely inconsistent respecting Knox. He knows well, because he himself points it out, that he was not “fearless,” but in times of danger quite the opposite. He was undoubtedly both a bully and a coward. Infinitely worse, however, he was an accessory to the murder of Beaton, and a *particeps criminis* in the murder of Rizzio. Pretending to favour liberty of conscience, he was an intolerant and cruel persecutor. All this Tytler himself clearly proves, yet so strong are preconceived notions and the force of prejudice that this author says that Knox “in his public career was consistent, fearless, sincere.” That he was devoted to religion, and “raised a considerable height above Moray, Argyle, Lethington, and the crowd of venal Barons.” The truth is Knox was very anxious to get a full share of church plunder, and violently abused the nobles for not giving it. He was a malicious zealot who unscrupulously joined in any crime which seemed to serve his purpose and gratify his malignant hatred of his enemies.

CHAPTER VI.

Darnley becomes a traitor to his assassin colleagues.—

Reconciliation with the Queen.—The Lords determine to kill Darnley.—Murder of Darnley.—Mistaken conduct of the Queen in respect to the Reforming Lords.—Opportunities of assenting to the rights of the Church.—Bothwell rules the State.—His mock trial and acquittal.—He seizes and marries the Queen.—The Church Revenue.—Causes of the Reformation.—Misfortunes of Mary.—Mary charged with Darnley's murder.—Her abdication.—Moray Regent.—His character.

THERE is even honour among thieves, and by nothing was a man more considered to disgrace himself, and to deserve the most condign punishment, than by the breach of one of those leagues or bands in which the feudal nobility frequently united for specific purposes. Such a covenant had been made between Darnley and the Reformers with reference to the murder of Rizzio, and this was now broken by Mary's husband, who even went so far as to oppose her merciful intentions towards his former colleagues. He betrayed them in the meanest manner, and endeavoured to

purchase his own safety by their destruction. From this time he was doomed exactly as if he had belonged to a secret society of modern times. The Lords of the Reformation could easily persuade themselves and their followers that the assassination of a traitor to their cause was as pleasing to God as the murder of an enemy.*

On the 19th of June, 1566, James VI. of Scotland was born in the Castle of Edinburgh. Mary soon recovered, and then endeavoured to strengthen the Government by healing the dissensions among the nobles, and reconciling malcontents. Again Moray became powerful in the Council, and in response to his intercession most of the leaders of the Reformation were pardoned. The "fearless" Knox, however, was an exception. He was perfectly safe, however, in the retreat to which motives of prudence had induced him to fly. Morton, Lindsay, Knox, and Ruthven remained proscribed, but Moray, Bothwell, Argyle, Athole, and Lethington urgently prayed for their pardon. The Queen was soon encompassed once more by the leaders of the Reformation.

* We find that Mary's disgust and horror of Darnley's participation in the foul murder of Rizzio did not continue in full force. Tytler says that "As the period of her confinement drew near, Mary's resentment softened towards the King. Uncertain that she should survive her confinement, she called for her nobility, took measures regarding the Government of the Kingdom, made her will, became reconciled to the King, and personally arranged everything for life or death." Vol. V., p. 354.

tion, and their power was completely established. Justice was not done, and we have to lament the weakness of Mary's Government. *Index damnatur cum nocens absolvetur.* The Queen was on good terms with Darnley, and he declared that she had given him no occasion for discontent.* His hatred of the Lords of the Congregation was, however, most imprudently exhibited, and he assumed the position towards them not only of a traitor to a bond of blood, but a determined enemy resolved to make every effort for their destruction. He declared that he would have the kingdom, and denouncing three of the principal conspirators (Lethington, Bellenden, and Macgill), all of whom held offices under the State, insisting that they should be deprived of their offices.

The Earl of Bothwell was at this time looked upon as an efficient military leader, and although he had joined the cause of the Reformers, he lacked their hypocrisy. He was undoubtedly an unblushing and unprincipled profligate capable of every crime, and the astute Moray soon saw in him a fitting tool for the murder of Darnley. Bothwell was easily flattered, and there is little doubt that at the time he was employed to subdue a border feud he had determined upon the death of Darnley and the abduction of his widow. The conduct of Darnley to Mary was openly insulting and outrageous.

* Keith, p. 347.

As a preliminary to more violent measures, Moray, Lethington, Bothwell, Huntley, and Argyle proposed a divorce which Mary declined. The Queen was sounded on this occasion by Secretary Maitland. "Think ye not we are here of the principal of your graces, nobility, and council, that shall not find the means to make your Majesty quit of him without prejudice of your son; and albeit that my Lord of Moray here present be a little less scrupulous for a Protestant nor than your grace is for a Papist, I am assured he will look through his fingers thereto and will behold our doings and say nothing thereto." The Queen at once was greatly alarmed, and declared her positive pleasure that nothing whatsoever against her honour should be done. "Better permit the matter remain in the state it is, abiding till God in His goodness put remedy thereto than that ye believing to do me service may possibly turn to my hurt or displeasure."* Another solemn league and covenant was now drawn up. This time the agreement entered into was for the murder of Darnley. The Covenant was written by James Balfour, afterwards President of the Supreme Council, and signed by Lethington, Huntley, Argyle, and Sir James Balfour.† A number of others including Morton, who had been foolishly pardoned, joined the conspiracy, and

* Ormston's Confession, Pitcairn's *Criminal Trials*, p. 511-12.

† Anderson's *Collections*, Vol. IV., p. 292

there can be no doubt that the entire project was looked upon with favour by the principal Reformers, although with a profound hypocrisy they afterwards charged the Queen with the commission of the murder. In spite of Darnley's sullen impracticable temper, Mary became reconciled to her husband,* and as he was recovering from severe illness (small-pox) caused him to be carefully carried on a litter from Glasgow to Edinburgh when at his own desire he did not reside at Craigmillar Castle, but in a house in a healthy part of the city styled "The Kirk in the Fields."

It was publicly known that a servant, named Bastian, in the household of the Queen, was to be married at Holyrood on Sunday 9th of February, (1566), and the Queen proposed to give "A Masque," at which she would be present. This was an opportunity of which the conspirators determined to take advantage. Mary spent the greater part of the day with her husband, and the reconciliation between them was evidently complete. She was obliged to go to Holyrood at night in accordance with her promise, and it was at the time that she was engaged in conversation with Darnley, previous to her departure, that Hepburn of Bolton,

* "At this moment the reconciliation between the Queen and her husband seem to be complete. She assiduously superintended every little detail which could add to his comfort. She treated him not only with attention, but tenderness, passed much of the day in his society, and had a chamber prepared for herself immediately below his, where she slept." Tytler, Vol. V., p. 381-2.

Hay of Tollo, and the other ruffians, secretly entered the chamber under that of the King and deposited a large quantity of gunpowder in bags. Bothwell was the executive leader, and carefully saw that everything was in readiness. Moray, knowing full well what was intended, left the Court a day previously to visit his country residence, where his wife was sick, and by that means hoped to avert suspicion from himself. There had recently been a great change in Darnley. He heard Mass devoutly; had changed his conduct to a wife who had been wonderfully forbearing and kind towards him, and seemed resolved to assist in re-establishing the Catholic Church in Scotland, the support of which he could clearly see was the only chance for the stability of the Throne. His correspondence with respect to this last matter was thoroughly known to the extreme Reformers, who planned his death, and furnished a very special reason, in addition to the powerful ones already in existence, for his immediate murder. After repeating the fifty-third Psalm, and performing his devotions, Darnley retired to rest. Taylor, his page, slept in the same room with him. The murderers, who had concealed themselves in the lower room, now ascended the stair, but did so in such a noisy manner as to awaken the King. Darnley, hastily putting on his shirt and a fur pelisse, rushed out in a vain attempt to escape, but was immediately intercepted. Then ensued a fearful struggle which lasted for some time as

Darnley was a powerful man. The cries of the combatants were heard by people living in the neighbourhood. But there could only be one result. This unfortunate victim of the Reformation was murdered like Beaton and Rizzio. It was intended, however, that the explosion shortly to take place should seem the cause of death, consequently Darnley was strangled and his body carried into a small orchard without the garden wall. It is said that at this crisis, Bothwell had joined the murderers, but the evidence rather seems to show that he was in bed at the time in his apartments at Holyrood, having taken care previously to see that all arrangements were perfected. A slow match had been laid communicating with the gunpowder in the lower room, and after the murder, the assassins were impatiently approaching it to discover the cause of the delay, when it suddenly took effect, and alarmed all Edinburgh by a terrific explosion. The house in which Darnley had lived was thoroughly destroyed, but it was quickly observed that neither his body nor that of the page had been injured by either fire or gunpowder; neither was there any mark of blood upon them, showing evidently that they had been strangled. Mary, so soon as she heard the fatal news, was completely overcome, and for days remained in her chamber. A reward of £2,000 was offered for the apprehension of the murderers. Bothwell, however, remained in attendance on the Queen, and she

was quite unaware of his complicity in the assassination of her husband. The fatal fault of Mary in placing implicit confidence in her advisers again proved most injurious. She trusted to their exertions for the apprehension of the murderers of Darnley, and the apathy that they naturally exhibited has been used as an argument by those who represent her as a monster in human form who murdered Darnley after having pretended to be reconciled to him. No doubt this charge has been completely refuted, but it is impossible not to blame Mary as a Sovereign for the culpable manner in which she allowed herself to be guided by the deceitful villains who on various occasions formed her advisers. This was from the first a fatal error, profiting by which the nobility were more easily able to establish the Reformation, and to plunder both the Church and the poor.

Without intending it, Mary was the greatest friend the cause of the Reformation had in Scotland, and she must have eventually seen the retributive justice of being calumniated and betrayed by the very men whose business it had always been to calumniate and betray the Catholic Church. She really joined them, was deceived by them, and enabled them to triumph. To prove that she had an opportunity of adopting another course, it is only necessary to advert to the fact that, previous to the events just alluded to, the Bishop of Mondive, Papal Nuncio for France, in a letter to Cosmo, Duke of Tuscany, reports that the Pro-

testant cause in Scotland was losing ground, “the Queen, if it pleased her to enter effectually into the policy of the other Catholic Sovereigns in Europe, might have done much towards the restoration of her own faith, *but nothing could induce her to act as she was required in that matter.** This Prelate had been specially appointed by the Pope to be Nuncio at the Scottish Court, but Mary positively refused to receive him, stating as a reason that he might be exposed to uncourteous usage, and that it was out of her power to protect his life. The Nuncio answered in the spirit of a true missionary, that he was quite ready to risk his life, and brave every consequence, if the Queen had sufficient courage to agree. Mary, however, in this instance, certainly lacked moral courage and that wisdom which ought to have guided her actions. Her continued refusal was consistent with her previous policy of playing into the hands of the Reformers, but it was certainly contrary to her duty and to her interests as a Catholic Queen. Shortly previous to the murder of Darnley, a special Ambassador from the Duke of Savoy arrived in Scotland, ostensibly for the purpose of offering an excuse for the non-attendance of his master at the baptism of the infant prince, but really with the view of privately conveying a special Papal missive from the Catholic powers, of whom the Duke of Savoy was an active agent. Mary was urged to join their league, to accept money and troops for the purpose

* Labanoff's “*Recueil des lettres de Marie Stuart.*”

of re-establishing the Church and legitimate authority, and to make war in Britain against the faithless Elizabeth and the corrupt traitors of the Reformation who surrounded her throne. Darnley had already identified his cause with that movement, and this no doubt hurried on his murder. Probably, if Mary had accepted these offers, her assassination would have been immediately attempted. The heads of the Reformation were always in reality the deadly enemies of Mary, as well as of the Catholic Church, which they identified with her. She committed the blunder and the crime of not in her turn identifying herself with the Catholic Church, and spurning any relations of unity with traitors who were merely reformers for purposes of plunder. She elected to treat these men as her friends, and had to bear the consequences. It may be said in reply that on her accession to the throne the cause of the Church was hopeless. A careful student of Scottish history will find that this view is thoroughly incorrect, and that the change that Mary Tudor was able to effect in England could also have been effected by Mary Stuart in Scotland. With her views of religion and politics it was unquestionably her duty to have tried to bring about that change. Instead, however, she made not the slightest effort in that direction, but from the first gave herself up to the guidance of evil and treacherous councillors. God in his infinite mercy allowed her to expiate these faults in this world, and she had eventually the

glory of dying for the Catholic faith on a scaffold in England. Bishop Beaton, the Ambassador for Scotland in Paris, found it his duty to earnestly urge upon the Queen the necessity of doing something to prevent a coalition against her, and to satisfy the people that she was resolved to do everything possible to bring to punishment the murderers of her late husband. "Here it is needful that you should show forth now rather than ever before the great virtue, magnanimity, and constancy which God has granted you." The Queen-mother of France, and her uncle the Cardinal, reproached her very severely for seeming remissness, and informed her very plainly that if she did not avenge the death of Darnley and clear herself from the imputations brought against her they would become her enemies.*

Mary it is true was ignorant, until she had eventually escaped from Bothwell's hands, that he was the murderer of her husband.†

But her foolish infatuation in allowing a ruffian of this description to direct the affairs of the State is difficult to understand. All the leading lords of the Confederation, however, were treacherous villains, only differing from each other in degrees of guilt. She had cast in her lot with them and had to rule accordingly. Bothwell, of course, solemnly

* Drury's letters to Cecil, MS. letters, State Paper Office, B. C., 29th.

† See Chamber's *Annals of Scotland*, and Miss Strickland's *Lives of the Queen's of Scotland*, (Mary.)

denied his guilt, and at a mock trial in Edinburgh, where 4,000 of his partisans were present, was acquitted by the verdict of a jury.

So powerful did the Earl of Bothwell become that he was able to obtain another solemn league and covenant, disgracefully agreeing to his marriage with Mary, signed by the reforming lords, the Earls of Morton, Argyle, Huntley, Cassilis, Sutherland, Glencairn Rothes, and Caithness, as well as by Lords Herries, Hume, Boyd, Seton, and Sinclair.*

The unfortunate Queen was evidently at the mercy of her chosen friends and councillors. On the 21st. of April, 1567, Mary proceeded to Stirling in order to visit her son, and Bothwell, assembling six hundred spearmen, determined to intercept her on the way back to Edinburgh. The Queen had but a small retinue, and having heard a rumour of danger so hastened towards the capital that if Bothwell had been only ten minutes later she would have been safe in the Castle of Edinburgh. As it was his troops surrounded the Queen and her cavalcade at Almond Bridge, six miles from the city, violently seized upon their sovereign, and conducted her to his Castle of Dunbar. There she was completely in his power for twelve days and felt compelled to marry him. The ceremony was subsequently performed by a Presbyterian minister, and in accordance with the forms of the Reformed Church. Bothwell had previously obtained a divorce from his lawful wife. In writing to Rome

* Anderson, Vol 1., p. 107.

subsequently, Mary begs that His Holiness be informed that she was made prisoner forcibly and against her will by the Earl of Bothwell, "and we were constrained to yield our consent yet against our will to him."*

The Hierarchy of the Catholic Church in Scotland had practically ceased to exist, and for more than two hundred years its adherents had to hear Mass in secret like the early Christians, and were forbidden that liberty of conscience which Protestantism proudly boasted it had introduced. Previous to this change Scotland was divided into two ecclesiastical provinces, under the Archbishops of St. Andrew's and of Glasgow. The former was Primate of Scotland and Metropolitan. The Bishops of Aberdeen, Brechin, Caithness, Murray, Orkney, and Ross, were suffragans to St. Andrew's; and the Bishops of Argyle, Dunkeld, Dunblane,

* Labanoffs *Lettres de Marie Stuart*, Vol. 3., p. 22. This statement of the unfortunate Queen is no doubt accurate. See Miss Strickland's valuable life, and Hosack's *Life of Mary Queen of Scots*. An absurd idea seems to have been always prevalent that in defending Mary the Catholic Church was defended. The truth is that Mary Queen of Scotland owed her destruction to joining the lords of the Reformation, and turning her back upon the Church. It is true that she was always steadfast in her belief, but her folly in being guided by Moray and Bothwell—both unprincipled traitors, could have but one result—her own ruin, and the ruin of Catholicity in Scotland. Elizabeth as the head of the English Reformation invariably plotted against Mary, but the latter never acted against this most false and dissimulating Queen, but was literally "led as a sheep to the slaughter."

Galloway, and the Isles were suffragans to Glasgow. The number of cathedrals and churches was about one thousand; of abbeys, monasteries, convents, and other religious houses about two hundred. The annual rental in money was as follows:— St. Andrew's, £3,000; Glasgow, £1,500; Aberdeen, £1,100; Brechin, £700; Caithness, £1,300; Dunblane, £400; Dunkeld, £1,600; Galloway, £1,300; Murray, £2,100; Orkney, £500; Ross, £500; Argyle, £1,200; the Isles, £1,000; The total annual yearly income from all sources of the monasteries and religious houses of Scotland, where the poor could always ask relief as a right, was more than £200,000. This was in a country whose inhabitants did not exceed half a million in number. The nobles of the Reformation so seized upon the property of the Church as to leave almost nothing for the ministers of the new religion, while the poor were entirely abandoned and left in painful destitution. To the mass of the people the spoliation was a direct and obvious disadvantage. To the nobles, the gain, in a temporal sense, was enormous.

So far as stemming the current of "reform" is concerned, it was not only possible, but at one time comparatively easy. All the nobles were not Reformers, while certainly, until the minds of the people had been poisoned by calumny and falsehood, the masses were not with them. Buckle truly says, "The complete success of this great revolution, and the speed with which it was

effected, are of themselves a decisive proof of the energy of those general causes by which the whole movement was controlled. For more than a hundred and fifty years there had been a deadly struggle between the nobles and the Church, and the issue of that struggle was the establishment of the Reformation and the triumph of the Aristocracy.* The people played a most subordinate part, as they were merely driven and directed by the conquering feudal leaders, and the men employed in their interest, and under their protection and guidance. Of course there were subsidiary reasons for the change, but this was the principal and leading cause. No doubt the influence of the Holy See had long been in abeyance; some Bishops and Abbots, quite unworthy of their office, had been appointed to these most important posts through favouritism of the civil power, and there were great irregularities which required remedy. The Council of Trent was then holding its Sessions, and at the last general Council of the Scottish clergy, held at Edinburgh on the 1st March 1559, presided over by the Primate, thirty-four canons were enacted, in which the most wise and judicious measures were adopted for the correction of all abuses. But it was not abuses which the Reformers desired to destroy,† it was the Catholic Church. They did

* Buckle's *History of Civilization in England*, Vol. III., p. 81.

† To the student of Scottish history, it would be laughable,

not wish to sweep away cobwebs and dust from the edifice, but to raze it entirely to the ground. Mary undoubtedly played into their hands, and her fatuous rule, in which she put herself entirely under the guidance of traitors, resulted in destruction to herself, as well as destruction to the Catholic Church in Scotland.*

if it were not so sad, to read of the Reforming leaders of Scotland desiring to establish a system of pure religion.

* The Reverend Mr. Lawson (Protestant Minister), in his *Account of the Church in Scotland*, says, "Were we to inquire minutely into the history of the Reformation in Scotland, we should find that the plunder of the Church was well shared among the ancestors of our present nobility and others, and that worldly considerations induced them to forward the Protestant cause rather than a conviction of its truth. If we take into account the annual value of all these abbeys, monasteries, nunneries, priories, hospitals, bishoprics, and the extensive lands and well-cultivated ground connected with them, we shall have some idea of the rich spoil which induced the greedy, hungry and profligate nobles of Scotland to forward the Protestant Reformation. The ancient Scottish Ecclesiastics were true patriots, and zealous supporters of the honour and independence of their country; and the monuments of their munificence, their love of learning, their spirit and their piety still remain."

The author of *The Monastic Annals of Teviotdale*, says, "The domains belonging to the monasteries were the best cultivated in the kingdom. The monks of Scotland had been long revered as the instructors and spiritual guides of the people, the benefactors of the poor, and the indulgent masters of numerous vassals and retainers."

Hosack's *Mary and her Accusers*: The plunder of the monasteries in England was a precedent which the nobles

The nobles of the Reformation, who were the real rulers of Scotland, looked upon the pre-eminence which Bothwell had attained with the utmost rage and jealousy. So long as a month before the fatal marriage, a powerful coalition had been formed against him, which comprised the Earls of Argyle, Morton, Athole and Mar, with the Earls of Glencairn, Cassilis, Eglinton, Montrose and Caithness; the Lords Boyd, Ochiltree, Ruthven, Drummond, Gray, Glammis, Innermeith, Lindsay, Hume and Herries, with the whole of West Meise and Teviotdale, and the most of Fife, Angus and Mearns. It is worthy of note that Sir Robert Melvil joined the confederacy for the purpose of rescuing his royal mistress from an unwilling servitude. The position of Mary was extremely peculiar and extremely unfortunate. De Croe, the French Ambassador, tells us that she looked wretched and was always in tears. Believing that the course she adopted was the correct one, she would consent to no divorce, and remained faithful to a compact which had been imposed upon her by force. The double dyed treason of the men opposed to her, was conspicuous. Morton, Argyle, Huntley, Lethington and Balfour, no doubt, possessed evidence to convict Bothwell of the murder of Darnley; but Bothwell could recriminate and hoped to follow in Scotland. "From the death of James V., until the union of the two crowns, Scotland was oppressed by a nobility the most rapacious and corrupt that probably ever existed."

prove, by producing the solemn league and covenant entered into between them, that they were also guilty of the same crime. It was impossible at this stage for the populace easily to discriminate, and certainly the attitude of Mary was such as to expose her to the most dismaying, although inaccurate, reflections. It could be seen from the first that the cause of Bothwell was ruined, and that the Queen had most seriously injured her position by being leagued with him. The Confederates drove them first from Borthwick Castle and afterwards, their own troops deserted them at Carberry Hill, near Edinburgh. There Kirkaldy of Grange assured his sovereign of the readiness of the Confederate Lords to obey her if Bothwell were dismissed. To this she replied that she would consent if the Lords would agree to return to their allegiance. A solemn assurance was then given to her to that effect, and after a few words with Bothwell he turned his rein and left the field, subsequently to make his escape from the realm, and to die in captivity in Denmark. The impulsive and over credulous Queen was again deceived in the basest manner. She was immediately made a prisoner. The spirit of the Stuarts then flamed up. Calling for Lindsay, one of the foremost and fiercest of the Barons, she took his hand and exclaimed, "By the hand which is now in yours I'll have your head for this." From this moment there was dead enmity between the Confederate Lords and Mary.

Their safety entirely hinged upon her destruction, and in any course to be taken their antecedents sufficiently proved that they would be free from scruples. After being treated with many indignities, the unfortunate Queen was confined as a prisoner in the castle of Lochleven. The Reforming Lords had now drawn the sword and thrown away the scabbard. To justify this extreme conduct to their sovereign, it was necessary to prove her guilt, and it was at this crisis, on the 20th June, 1567, that the Lords of the Secret Council stated that, through the treachery of one of Bothwell's servants, they had obtained possession of a silver casket, said to contain private letters and sonnets addressed by the Queen to Bothwell.* One fact upon which sufficient stress has not been laid is, that the Confederate Lords unquestionably allowed Bothwell to escape. At Carberry Hill he was completely in their power when they permitted him to ride away. Tytler tells us† that "the Lords of the Secret Council, who had suffered the prin-

* That these have now been proved to be forgeries, see on this subject Hosack's *Mary Stuart and her Accusers*, Miss Strickland's *Life of Mary Queen of Scots*, Labanoff's *Letters of Mary*, etc., etc. The men who brought these clumsy forgeries had already proved by their lives that they were capable of any crime.

† Tytler, Vol. V., p. 432. A Captain Blacater was seized for the murder, found guilty and executed. This poor man was a scapegoat, who was in all probability innocent. "He died solemnly calling upon God to witness his innocence," and "revealed no particulars," having really no particulars to reveal.

cipal actor in the Queen's murder to escape, became active in their search for inferior delinquents."

Dissension among the reforming nobles broke out at intervals. The Hamiltons, suspecting that in case of the deposition of the Queen a Regency under Moray, Morton, or Lennox, would be inimical to their interests, determined in a council held at Dumbarton to declare for the liberation of the Queen. They were joined by Argyle, Huntley, Herries, Crawford, Seton, Fleming, and others. At the present crisis the Lords of the Secret Council viewed the movement with great alarm. Murderers of Bothwell were in their own ranks and among their principal leaders, but with supreme audacity they determined to base their attack upon the Queen, principally on a charge of which they knew she was innocent. The same tools who had helped in obtaining for them the plunder of the Church, were now used against their sovereign, and for the purpose of enabling them to secure their acquired property, and their personal safety, by retaining the reins of Government. John Knox, who had as usual kept out of the way when there was any real danger, was now called upon to exercise his peculiar powers. This Reformer had always hated Mary, and he now was put in possession of a brief by means of which he could indulge his malignity freely. The Gospel of the Merciful Saviour was prostituted for the purpose of condemning his sovereign before a trial, in order that a policy of hatred and revenge might

be pursued. Throckmorton, the English Ambassador, reports that on the 19th July, 1567, he listened to a sermon from the Reformer, "who took a piece of Scripture forth of the Books of the King's," and did inveigh vehemently against the Queen, and persuaded extremities towards her by application of his text. I did, after the sermon, move such of the council as were present to persuade the Lords to advise the preachers not to intermeddle in these matters." He feared that "the Ministers, going on so rigorously, might draw the multitude," but this was the very object that the Lords had in view. Unfortunately, the multitude was drawn, not only at this time, but for generations. Abuse and calumnies took the place of argument, and an ignorant mob was easily influenced. Penal laws were put in force against all Catholics, and no man dared to profess the religion of his forefathers, much less to attempt the least reply or refutation. Knox, however, did not fail to make certain conditions with the Confederate Lords before lending them his powerful aid. His principal stipulations comprised the recognition of the Act of Parliament passed at Edinburgh, in 1560, overthrowing "Popery," and establishing Protestantism, and the restoration of the patrimony of the Church, so that he and the Ministers might obtain a share. Of course the Lords solemnly agreed to everything he asked, and no doubt would have signed a solemn league and covenant if one had been presented to them. The proverbial honour among thieves was in the

sequel again found wanting, as the nobles retained the Church property and left the Ministers to starve.

Queen Elizabeth, with her usual dissimulation, despatched her Ambassador with public instructions to demand the release of Mary, but with private orders to sanction and approve of the conduct of the Confederate Lords.*

Mary was treated with cruel indignity at Lochleven Castle, while Knox omnipotent with the mob, "thundered out cannon hot against her." It must be clearly understood that he had made a special bargain with the nobles, who had now figuratively burnt their ships, and whose policy required the destruction of the power and if possible of the life of their Sovereign. By means of compulsion Mary had to sign her abdication, and to appoint her "dear brother," the Earl of Moray, Regent of the Kingdom. Her son James was crowned King, and Lindsay and Ruthven, two of the most ferocious Reformers, did not scruple to attest upon oath that which they knew to be false, "that Mary's demission was her own free act." †

* "Her object in despatching her Ambassador, Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, was professedly to procure the Queen's liberty, but really to encourage the confederates, to attach them to her services, to obtain possession of the Prince if possible, to induce the captive Queen to resign the Crown, and to hold out to Moray, with whom she, Melvil, and the Lords of the Secret Council were now in treaty, the hope of returning to his country and becoming the chief person in the Government." MS. letter, State Paper Office, Melvil to Cecil, July 8th, 1567. Enoted by Tytler, Vol. V., p. 441.

† Tytler, Vol. V., p. 454.

The party of the Hamiltons, who had pretended to support the Queen, wished to put her to death, and one of their party, Tullibardine, informed the English Ambassador that they saw no outlet from political difficulties so good as Mary's death. "They love not the Queen, and they know she hath no great fancy to any of them; and they fear her the more because she is young and may have many children, which is the thing they would be rid of." Accustomed as he was to perfidy, this was too much even for Throckmorton, and he found the greatest difficulty in believing that such villainy was possible, until satisfied by the solemn assurances of one of the principal conspirators. Moray now returned from France to Scotland in order to assume the office of Regent, and met Lethington and Morton at Whittingham, in the same house in which these nobles had held the conference with Bothwell, in which Darnley's death was determined upon. These audacious hypocrites cordially sympathised with each other, expressed their detestation of the murder, which they themselves had committed, and they determined resolutely to avenge it. In other words it was agreed that they should shift the "burden of guilt" from their own shoulders to those of the Queen. This covenant was certainly kept. Forged letters and other documents were subsequently made use of as evidence against Mary, and the fierce dogs of war were loosed in the persons of Knox and the Reforming Ministers. The most

astute and masterly hypocrite of all the Confederate lords was unquestionably the Queen's natural brother, the Earl of Moray. In order the better to consolidate his power he pretended to entertain some scruple about the abdication. To set this at rest he declared that it was necessary to see Mary at Lochleven. There he bullied his unfortunate sister and sovereign in the most dastardly manner, and declared that to save her life he was ready to sacrifice his own, but that unfortunately the decision lay not with him but with the Lords, the Church, and the people. She need not expect to live if she dared to escape, or to attempt to obtain assistance from her friends. If she deplored her past sins then he might hold out some hope of her life being spared. Mary, weak from cruel captivity and terrified by these cowardly threats, earnestly begged Moray to assume the Regency, and was again fatally deceived into thinking that this miscreant—the most detestable hypocrite and villain of the Reformation—was really her friend. Knox was a fanatic, a ruffian, and an accessory to murder ; Ruthven was an assassin and a fanatic ; but Moray was a cool calculating hypocrite, who made use of such men as Knox and Ruthven merely as tools, taking care to keep clear from apparent complicity in their deeds, while at the same time he directed them as chief artificer, and obtained the lion's share of profit. Of all the contemptible traitors of the time Moray was *facile princeps*.

CHAPTER VII.

Moray's rule.—Sham prosecution of Darnley's murderers.—Meeting of Parliament.—Gross hypocrisy of Lethington.—The casket letters.—Mary escapes from Lochleven.—Assembles her forces.—Is defeated by Moray at Langside.—Escapes to England.—Throws herself on the protection of Elizabeth.—Trial of Mary.—Her acquittal by Elizabeth.—Her captivity.—Moray's conduct.—John Knox again.—Moray assassinated.—Morton becomes Regent.—Knox prophesies.—His cowardly malignity.—Frightful condition of Scotland.—Earl Mar poisoned.—Morton Regent.—Death of Knox.—His character.

Moray soon obtained full possession of the reins of Government as Regent of Scotland, and so soon as he felt he was safe declared to the English Ambassador, that he approved of the conduct of the Confederate Lords. To show demonstratively the real character of Moray we have only to refer to his action in respect to the infamous Sir James Balfour, who had been notoriously an intimate friend of Bothwell, and a principle actor in Darnley's murder. This man who was governor of

the Castle of Edinburgh, delivered up that fortress to Moray, received a present of five thousand pounds, the gift of the Priory of Petlenweem, and an annuity for his son. We do not find Knox or any of the clergy protesting against this condonation and reward of murder. The truth is, all were for the party and to it and its supposed interests, honour, patriotism, and even decency were sacrificed. The retention by the nobles of the property of the Church and the poor, required their adoption of other evils—the destruction of Catholicism in Scotland, and the ruin of their sovereign. The leaders of the mob were mere puppets set up by the nobility. We shall soon see, however, that these mob orators got the mob to follow them and became powerful in their turn, and eventually plunged the nation in revolutionary and seditious disturbances. They did not receive their share of Church plunder, and eventually became the deadly foes of the very nobles to whom they owed their existence.

In order to show diligence in proceeding against Darnley's murderers, a few subordinates were arrested. But one of these men named Tollo, not only confessed that he was guilty but distinctly stated the names of his noble accomplices. This list specially included Lethington, Morton, and Argyle, without whose support Moray knew well he would not be safe, consequently the Regent suppressed this man's examination and indefinitely postponed his trial. As Tytler says "The truth probably was that Moray had been long aware of

the true character of the persons by whose successful guilt he now profited, and had determined to favour the higher culprits whilst he let loose the vengeance of the law upon the lesser delinquents.”*

These were the men who headed the Reforming movement, and were supported by John Knox and the Ministers.

A new Parliament met on the 15th December, 1567, whose discussions were opened by Lethington, one of Darnley's murderers, who said that “the quietness as to religion at present enjoyed, declared sufficiently the victory that God by His word has obtained among you within the space of eight or nine years; how feeble the foundation was in the eyes of men, how unlikely it was to rise so suddenly to so large and huge a greatness, with what calmness the work has proceeded, not one of you is ignorant. Iron has not been heard within the house of the Lord; that is to say the whole has been builded, set up, and erected to this greatness without bloodshed. Note it I pray you as a singular testimony of God's favour, and a peculiar benefit granted only to the realm of Scotland, not as the most worthy, but chosen out by his providence from among all nations, for causes hid and unknown to us, and to forshow His Almighty power, that the true religion has obtained a free course universally throughout the whole realm, and yet not a Scotsman's blood shed in the forthsetting of the whole

* Tytler, Vol. VI., p. 22.

quarrel." This was one of the great Reformers, second certainly in ability to none except Moray, and the speech just quoted is a fair specimen of the falsehood, cant, and hypocrisy which characterised the movement.*

By an act of this Parliament of which Lethington, Morton, and other murderers of Darnley were conspicuous ornaments, the Confession of Faith was approved of, Catholicism denounced, and the Presbyterianism of John Knox declared to be "the immaculate spouse of Christ."

By an Act of the Privy Council, dated 16th September, 1568, it is declared that the Earl of Morton (one of Darnley's murderers) had delivered a casket with letters and sonnets from the Queen. The Parliament in the most unjust manner founded upon these an evidence of Mary's guilt, without giving her by counsel or in person the slightest opportunity of examining the so-called proofs produced against her. The bond which connected Morton, Lethington, Balfour, Argyle, and others,

* MS. State Paper Office. An oration of the Lord of Lethington. Tytler says apropos to this "oration" (Vol. VI., p. 26) "When we recollect the events of the few last years—the rising of Moray against the Queen's marriage, the murder of Rizzio, the flight of Morton, the assassination of Darnley, the confederacy against Bothwell, and the imprisonment of the Queen, all of them events more or less connected with the establishment of the Reformation in Scotland—and remember also that Lethington was deeply engaged in them all, it is certainly difficult whether most to condemn, the gross inaccuracy of this picture, or the hardihood evinced by its coming from his lips."

with the murder was at the same time carefully burnt.*

As to the unfortunate subordinates in that deed of blood, they were arraigned, convicted, and executed in one day. Hepburn of Balton, when dying on the scaffold, distinctly declared that Argyle, Lethington, and Huntley had subscribed the bond for the murder, but as these men belonged to the Godly Reformed religion and Government they were of course allowed to go scot free.

Suddenly a most disagreeable surprise disconcerted the Regent and his adherents, Mary had escaped from Lochleven. Moving quickly to Hamilton she was there surrounded by the Earls of Eglington, Cassilis, Argyle, and Rothes; the Lords Yester, Somerville, Livingston, Herries, Fleming, Ross, Borthwick, and several other barons. The Regent was engaged in public business at Glasgow, only eight miles distant. If he had hesitated he would have been lost. Retreat he knew was incompatible with safety, therefore, with that energy and ability which characterised him he sent information to the Merse, Lothien, and Stirlingshire, so effectually as to raise an army of four thousand men. He was thus enabled to strike a decisive blow before Ogilvie, Huntley and the Northern men could join the Queen's forces. Mary, with that amiable infatuation which always

* Drury to Cecil, 28th November, 1597. "The writings which did comprehend the names and consents of the chief for the murdering of the King is turned into ashes."

induced her to endeavour to compromise in order to save bloodshed, desired if possible to come to terms with Moray, but the latter felt that he had long ago thrown away the scabbard and that no terms were possible. Quickly moving his forces under the direction of Kirkaldy of Grange, one of the first soldiers of the time, he engaged Mary's badly commanded troops at Langside, near Glasgow, and completely routed them. The unfortunate Queen watched the battle from a neighbouring height, and when she saw her army dispersed fled in great terror and at her utmost speed. She did not dare to draw bridle until she found herself at the Abbey of Dundrennan, sixty miles from the fatal field. Against the advice of her faithful and devoted servants, she determined to throw herself upon the protection of her perfidious rival Elizabeth, and with this view proceeded to Carlisle and wrote to the Queen of England requesting that she might be sent for immediately, "for my condition is pitiable not to say for a Queen, but even for a simple gentlewoman. I have no other dress than that in which I escaped from the field. My first day's ride was sixty miles across the country, and I have not since dared to travel except by night." *

She had placed herself entirely in the hands of Elizabeth who at once took complete advantage of this fatal mistake. The Queen of Scotland was kept as a prisoner and orders were issued to prevent her escape. She earnestly but in vain asked for

* Anderson, Vol. IV., p. 29.

an interview with Elizabeth, so that she might clear herself from the cruel calumnies of her rebellious subjects ; and sending a ring which bore the emblem of a heart upon it, a gift from Elizabeth, emphatically wrote “ Remember I have kept my promise. I have sent you my heart in the ring, and now I have brought to you both heart and body, to knit more firmly the tie that binds us together.”

From the time of the unwarranted and cruel imprisonment of Mary in England, she obtained the priceless advantage of suffering martyrdom for the Catholic faith. Tytler says, “ Although I must strongly condemn the conduct of the English Queen, it is impossible not to see the difficulties by which she was surrounded. The party which it was her interest to support was that of Moray and the Protestants. She looked with dread on France, and the resumption of French influence in Scotland. Within her own realm the Roman Catholics were unquiet and discontented, and in Ireland constantly on the eve of rebellion—if such a word can be used to the resistance of a system too grinding to be tamely borne. All these impatient spirits looked to Mary as a point of union and strength. Was the Queen of England at such a crisis, and having such a rival in her power, to permit her to re-establish the Catholic party, and possibly the Roman Catholic religion, in Scotland ? ”*

* Tytler, Vol. VI., pp. 48 and 49. The moment Mary heard the words “ trial ” and “ judge ” applied to her case she in-

Of course not, the end was again made to justify the means, and without jurisdiction. Mary was kept a prisoner, while Moray was thoroughly supported, and every facility afforded for the mock trial at which the Queen of Scotland was unjustly condemned on false and forged evidence. The expiatory sacrifice of Mary, endured nineteen years and terminated on the scaffold. She suffered and gloriously died for the Catholic faith, whose cause she had at one time foolishly deserted by putting her trust in the traitors and robbers of the Reformation.

At the very time that Moray was zealously urging forward the destruction of his sovereign, on the ground of the murder of Darnley, he was employing Sir James Balfour, who, by his own confession, was one of the King's murderers, in the most confidential affairs of Government. At this critical time, Mary committed another grave error by being weak enough to enter into a compact with her treacherous and powerful enemy Elizabeth. The latter agreed, "if she would commit her cause to be heard by Her Highness's order, but not to make Her Highness judge over her, but rather as to her dear cousin and friend" she would certainly re-establish her "in her seat regal," and dignantly declared that it was God alone who could be her judge—she was amenable to no human tribunal. Of her own free will she made Elizabeth her confident, and to defend herself against the falsehoods brought against her, and "to utter to her such matters as had never yet been disclosed to any human being."

Mary agreed that if this "were done she would renounce the English succession, abandon the Mass, and receive the Common Prayer after the fashion of the Church of England." No doubt, as regards religion, Mary intended personally to remain a Catholic, and recognised the fact that the Reformation was already established in Scotland. She had great reason, however, bitterly to regret every agreement she was ever induced to yield to in favour of a cause against both her conscience and her interest. If she had from the first recognised and acted up to her duties as a Catholic Queen she might have saved both herself and Scotland. Nothing could surpass the perfidy used against this most unfortunate woman. Pressed by Huntley and Argyle, who had already completely reduced the northern and western parts of Scotland, under the Queen's authority, an agreement was made that Moray should desist from hostilities if Mary gave similar orders to her friends. These orders were duly given by the Queen of Scotland and duly obeyed by those to whom they were sent, but Moray openly violated the compact, and continued the war. At length the wily Elizabeth, when Moray was safe and prosperous, sent orders for him to lay down his arms and despatch commissioners to York to answer for his conduct. Now commences a series of acts as extraordinary as any recorded in history. An independent Queen put on her trial, found innocent, and yet retained in captivity while her rebellious subjects are counte-

nanced and favoured. The evidence, chiefly of a documentary nature, was not submitted by the court to the accused, although a request to be permitted to examine it was frequently and urgently made.* At last the English Queen, after having the fullest opportunity of examining the letters of that casket, pronounced definitely "that nothing had been produced or shown by Moray and his adherents against their sovereign which should induce the Queen of England, for anything yet seen, to conceive an ill opinion of her sister." Mary was nevertheless kept prisoner, while Moray was allowed to return to his government in Scotland.

"Moray was perfectly aware of the accession of both Lethington and Morton to the murder of the King. This both prior and subsequent events proved. . Yet did he not scruple to bring these

* Through her commissioners, Mary stated "that although she still insisted upon her right to be heard in person, and adhered to her protestation, it was not her intention to pass over in silence the atrocious calumnies with which she had been assailed; that Moray and his accomplices, in accusing her, had been guilty of a traitorous falsehood, and had imputed to her a crime of which they were guilty themselves. She then enjoined them to demand inspection both of the copies and the originals of the letters which had been produced against her, and she engaged to give such an answer as should triumphantly establish her innocence." Tytler, Vol. VI., p. 77. These documents were persistently refused, so that their inspection by Mary and her commissioners was impossible. How can any judgment against her be formed on evidence of this description?

two accomplices to England, and employ Morton as his assistant in the accusation of his sovereign. Such a course, which could be dictated only by the ambition of retaining the whole power of the Government in his hands, seems unworthy of the man who was the leader of the Reformation in Scotland, and professed an extraordinary regard for religion. It was cruel, selfish, and unprincipled.”*

At this time Moray had become a tool in the hands of Elizabeth, but was able, by his extreme powers of dissimulation, to deceive even this astute princess. The captive Queen’s party was very powerful in Scotland, but Moray was successful also with them. The egregious error they committed was that of trusting to his honour, and consenting to a convention of the nobles, where two of their leaders were apprehended; and the Regent made no reply when they declared that they had observed every article of their treaty, had placed their lives and lands at his disposal, relied upon his honour most solemnly pledged, and could not believe that he would disgrace himself by an act of fraud and tyranny. “Fraud and tyranny” was a suitable motto both for this leader

* With regard to the letters which comprise *the evidence against Mary*, Tytler says (Vol. VI., p. 84): “The Regent’s refusal to produce the originals to the accused, and the state in which the copies have descended to our times, evidently garbled, altered, and interpolated, throws on him the utmost suspicion, and renders it impossible for any sincere inquirer after truth to receive such evidence.”

of the Reformation and the cause he championed. At this time Lethington gained a party, powerful both in England and Scotland, whose object was the restoration of Mary and her marriage to the Duke of Norfolk.* The Regent consequently caused him to be arrested for the murder of Darnley, but Kirkaldy of Grange carried him off to the castle of Edinburgh, of which he was the governor, and these two unprincipled men became now the leaders of a party in favour of the sovereign whom they hitherto endeavoured to destroy. At this time Moray's popularity had greatly decreased. He was blamed for treachery to his associates, haughtiness to his own countrymen, and that unpatriotic subserviency to England which characterised all leaders of the Reformation, and was in direct opposition to the patriotic and popular cause for which Wallace had died and Bannockburn been fought.

At the period to which we have now come, John Knox distinguished himself by his devoted adherence to the Regent Moray, and to that strong party in Scotland of which he was the leader. As "the hart thirsts after fountains of water," so did the Reformer thirst for Mary's blood. The malignity of his hatred to this unfortunate Queen

* The Duke of Norfolk was arrested shortly afterwards in England, and then Moray, "with meanness," gave up to the English Government the letters sent to him by this nobleman. A rising in the north of England, in favour of Catholicism, took place shortly afterwards.

can be best judged by his own words. "If ye strike not at the root, the branches which appear to be broken will bud again, and that more quickly than men can believe, with greater force than we can wish."* This letter was sent to England by the Regent, and at the same time he demanded that Mary should be delivered up to him in exchange for the rebel Earl of Northumberland. It would be well for Elizabeth to consider what danger might ensue to both the realms by the increase of the factions which favoured Papistry, and the Queen of Scots' title. Above all—specially alluding to Knox's letter—he entreated her to remember that the heads of all these troubles were at her commandment, for which, if she did not provide a remedy, the fault must lie with herself.† Here we have Knox counselling another murder—that of the Queen of Scots, his lawful sovereign, after she had been absolutely acquitted by Elizabeth. Our readers must remember that we find in the words of one of the leading Presbyterian divines of the day, "*To know John Knox is to know the Scottish Reformation.*"‡

Moray had made use of assassination to gratify

* MS. State Paper Office, Knox to Cecil, 2nd June, 1569-70. Tytler says that Knox urged the absolute necessity of putting Mary to death (Vol. VI., p. 110), and quotes the letter, an extract of which is given above.

† State Papers quoted by Tytler, Vol. VI. p. 112.

‡ St. Giles Lectures, p. 129 of First Series. Lecture by the Rev. D. Macleod, Chaplain to the Queen.

his ambition, and in his own person fell a victim to assassination. It was a faction that made Moray wealthy and powerful, and it was a faction that destroyed him. James Hamilton, of Bothwellhaugh, had been taken prisoner at Langside, and the Regent punished him by confiscating his estate. His wife, the heiress of Woodhouselee, retired to that property, on the river Esk, whence she was cruelly driven, almost naked, on a bitterly cold night. Hamilton became the ready and desperate tool of the enemies of Moray, and knowing that the Regent had to pass through Linlithgow, lay in wait for him there. Concealing himself in a house, he waited until the Regent came opposite, and then, levelling his gun with deliberate aim, shot him dead. Hamilton then mounting his horse successfully escaped, and was received in triumph by the Lord Arbroath, of whom Bothwellhaugh was a retainer, and the powerful faction of the Hamiltons. Thus suddenly was the first great leader of the Scottish Reformation called to judgment, at the time when he was plotting against the life of his sovereign. His funeral obsequies in Edinburgh were particularly grand, and in St. Giles's Church Knox preached a sermon of praise, taking for his text, "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord."*

* The fact that this most unscrupulous villain has been highly praised by Presbyterian writers in spite of notorious facts clearly shows that here, as in the case of John Knox, any guilt can be palliated or excused in a man who was an

The death of Moray greatly strengthened the party of Mary, which became more powerful than that of her opponents, and would, no doubt, have been successful but for the opposition of the Queen of England. Elizabeth considered the Reformation in Scotland as a necessary tool, and at all hazards strenuously supported its extreme leaders. While William Maitland, of Lethington, and Kirkaldy of Grange, changed their cause and adopted that of Mary, the Earl of Morton became the successor of Moray as the leader of the Presbyterian host who had fully determined that her destruction was absolutely necessary.

enemy to the Catholic faith. Tytler is compelled to say (Vol. VI., p. 117) : "He consented to the murder of Rizzio ; to compass his own return to power he unscrupulously leagued himself with men whom he knew to be the murderers of the king ; used their evidence to convict his sovereign ; and refused to turn against them till they began to threaten his power, and declined to act as the tools of his ambition. If we regard private faith and honour, how can we defend his betrayal of Norfolk, and his consent to deliver up Northumberland ? If we look to love of country, what are we think of his last ignominious offers to Elizabeth ? If we go higher still and seek for that love which is the only test of religious truth, how difficult is it to think that it could have a place in his heart, whose last transaction went to aggravate the imprisonment, if not to recommend the death, of a miserable princess, his own sister and his sovereign." The leading members of the Confederation against the Catholic Church died violent deaths—Moray, Wood, Lennox, Lethington, Kirkaldy of Grange, were cut off in a tragic manner ; Regent Mar died suddenly of poison ; Bothwell died a captive in Denmark, swollen with dropsy.

Tytler tells us that their great leader and the soul of every measure—the Earl of Morton—was a man bred up from his infancy in the midst of civil commotion, and so intensely selfish and ambitious that country, kindred, or religion were readily trampled on in his struggle for power. His interest had made him a steady Protestant. By his professions of attachment to the Reformation he gained the powerful support of Knox and the Kirk, and he was completely devoted to England. His principal associates were Lennox, Mar, Glencairn, Buchan, Glammis, Ruthven, Lindsay, Cathcart, Methvin, Ochiltree, and Saltoun. It was the interest of England to ferment strife in Scotland, and that both parties should exhaust themselves in civil war.* The plots and plans of Elizabeth were only too successful, and the unfortunate country was deluged in blood and plunged in the most frightful disorder. It must not be imagined that the Earl of Morton was in any way subservient to the Reformed preachers. On the contrary he ruled them with a rod of iron, and caused one or two ministers to be hanged for having offended him.† He was confessedly one of

* Elizabeth's design was to let loose her vengeance upon the friends of Mary, to destroy the country by fire and sword, and to incite the different factions to actual hostilities. MS. letter, Cecil.

† Morton lived in open and scandalous immorality. A minister having dared to refer to the subject was hanged by order of the Regent. See *Chambers's Annals of Scotland*, Vol. II.

the murderers of Darnley, and in all respects a notorious ruffian; nevertheless he was accepted by John Knox and his coadjutors as the leader of the Reformation in succession to the crafty and traitorous Moray. The Reformer, “who never feared the face of man,” could be insolent with impunity to a defenceless woman, but he was careful not to speak of the shameful and open crimes of Morton. Death, according to this cowardly hypocrite,* should be the penalty of the Queen because she was merely charged with the murder of Darnley; but men who had avowedly committed the deed were sure of impunity if they declared in favour of the Kirk and were strong enough to make it dangerous to speak against them. Anything more contemptible than the bullying insolence of Knox to the Queen, and his truckling to Morton, it is difficult to imagine. Not a syllable was said against the powerful Regent, a known murderer and adulterer, but of Mary, imprisoned and helpless, who had not been found guilty, but in fact, declared innocent by Elizabeth, it was thus that the “fearless” Reformer spoke: “It has been objected to me that I have ceased to pray for my sovereign, and have used railing imprecations against her. Sovereign to me she is not, neither am I bound to pray for

* Knox precipitately fled from Edinburgh on the entry of his enemies—the Hamiltons. In all cases he carefully consulted his own personal safety. Yet “he never feared the face of man.” See Tytler, Vol. VI., p. 158.

her in this place." He goes on to speak of the threatenings that he had denounced against murderers and idolators, and how God had heard his prayer. The blasphemous plan of prophecying evil against those he malignantly hated was tried in the case of Cardinal Beaton, when it was well known that he would be assassinated, and a notorious instance of it was afforded by the case of the unfortunate Kirkaldy of Grange. Filled with deadly hatred, Knox had declared that his enemy would be dragged from the rock of Edinburgh, wherein he trusted, and hanged in the face of the sun. Knowing well, when he uttered these words, that the castle would certainly be taken, and being aware of the merciless policy of Morton, which Knox abetted, the prediction was quite certain of fulfilment. The fratricidal strife which raged during the regency of Lennox, Mar, and Morton—the last named being the real leader of the Reformers—is well described by Tytler, who presents us with a sad picture of the state of the country. The first fruits of the Reformation were indeed bitter, and Scotland presented a sight which might have drawn pity from the hardest heart. 'Her sons were engaged in butchering each other; every peaceful and useful art neglected; agriculture, commerce, and manufactures at a stand-still; rapine, plunder, and murder, in the name of the Gospel, thoroughly attended to. Even "women coming to market were seized and scourged, and as punishment did not prevent the

repetition of the offence, one delinquent, who ventured to retail her country produce, was barbarously hanged in her own village, near the city.* These are homely details, but they point to much intensity of national misery. When we consider the aggregate of human misery and guilt which such a state of things supposes, it is impossible to withhold our abhorrence at the cold-blooded policy which, for its own ends, could foster its continuance." Yet, at this moment, Elizabeth had thoroughly secured the services of the Earl of Morton by means of a pension, and he did his utmost in return to oppose every effort to restore peace to his unfortunate country. The unconditional surrender of his enemies, and the destruction of the captive Queen were first necessary. This policy John Knox and his Reformers heartily supported.

A secret plot for the murder of the Queen of Scots† was concerted by Elizabeth and her Ministers, who determined to send Mary to Scotland and then have her put to death by the Reformers. It is unnecessary to say that Morton and Knox highly approved of the plan. Killigrew, the agent employed by the English court, writes to Cecil and Leicester: "I trust to satisfy Morton, and as for John Knox, that thing, as you

* The village of West Edmonston. *Diurnal of Occurrences*, p. 269, quoted by Tytler, Vol. VI., p. 168.

† See for full proof of assertions in the text, Tytler, Vol. VI., pp. 178 to 185.

may see by my despatch to Mr. Secretary, is done and doing daily; the people in general will bend to England. . . . John Knox is now so feeble that he can scarce stand alone." By the advice of the Reformer, a convention of the professors "of the true religion" was called to consult upon the danger of Papist conspiracies, this being wisely considered a preliminary to prepare the people for the Queen's murder. Morton declared that he desired her execution as a sovereign salve for all their sores, but stipulated that money payments should be made by Elizabeth, so that the transaction became as sordid and contemptible as it is possible to imagine. The only cause of delay on the part of the Regent Mar, and the real Regent, Morton, "was the selfish wish of making the most profit of the cruel bargain." Cecil had ordered that the co-operation of the Kirk should be made use of, and we find that the Reformers, through their Ministers, very eagerly became accomplices in this scheme of iniquity.

Lennox, the preceding Regent, had been stabbed by an assassin, and now his brother in crime, Mar, was attacked by mortal illness, and died suddenly at Stirling, on the 28th of October, 1572. With the decease of this nobleman the project for the murder of Mary collapsed. Morton succeeded him as Regent,* and on the very day he was chosen, 24th

* To show the utter meanness and baseness of this great leader of the Reformation (Morton) we find that although in his exile the Earl of Northumberland had treated him with the

November, 1572, John Knox died. The greatest curse of God, final impenitence, seemed to attend this ruffian on his deathbed. He departed this life with a foul and malignant prediction* against one of his enemies, evidently showing that he was still instigated by the same implacable feelings that had urged him to be an accessory in the murder of Beaton and Rizzio. One of his last deeds had been to join in a plot for the murder of his lawful sovereign, but he died without the slightest expression of sorrow for the acts of apostasy, lust, hypocrisy, violence, rapine, and murder, which had characterised his life. In considering Knox as *the Reformer*, it is very desirable to remember that in the really dangerous part of the Reformation he absolutely took no part. "The really important part of his life in regard to Scotland was in and after 1559, when the triumph of Protestantism was already secure, and when he reaped the benefit of what had been effected during his long absence from his own country."† He ran utmost kindness, when this nobleman became a captive in Scotland, Morton avariciously sold him to Elizabeth for a sum of money. Tytler VI., p. 188.

* "It appears to me that in this and other similar predictions, the dying Reformer, who was not only intimately acquainted with, but personally engaged in the secret correspondence between his party and England, availed himself of this knowledge to fulminate threats and warnings which he knew the advance of the English army was so soon likely to fulfil." Tytler VI., p. 196.

† Buckle, Vol. II., p. 75.

away from danger and bullied like a coward when he could do so with impunity. He gained notoriety, two wives, and a small share in church plunder. He was all his life a fermentor of sedition and a curse to the unfortunate country which gave him birth. Perhaps the most striking trait in his character was his inexorable relentlessness and persistent malignant hatred of his enemies. *

He never forgave the Queen of Scots although she specially tolerated Presbyterianism. Like Calvin he persecuted to death those that dared to differ from him. To his country he left a fearful legacy in the hateful, incoherent and seditious spirit which for more than two hundred years animated Presbyterianism, and of which traces remain at the present day. The religion of John Knox was certainly not the religion of the Gospel, but a perverted version of that of the Jews, in which intolerance and hate, narrow bigotry and violence did duty for charity, tolerance, and mercy.

* A contemporary writer (Nichol Burne) referring to Knox's ridiculous second marriage, when he was 58 years of age, incidentally refers to the notorious fact of "his deadly hatred to the house of Hamilton," simply because a lady of that house had previously refused him.

CHAPTER VIII.

Regency of Morton.—Murder condoned by the Government of the Gospel.—Morton's avarice.—Elizabeth's parsimony saves Mary.—Disaffection against Morton.—His capture, trial, and execution.—Excellent conduct of Mary in captivity.—Her fortitude and patience.—The casket letters.—Proofs of their falsity.—Trial of Mary.—Condemnation.—Elizabeth endeavours to kill Mary secretly and fails.—Execution of Mary Queen of Scots.—Lies of Elizabeth.—Effect of Mary's death.

Shortly after Morton had personally assumed the Regency, it was found desirable to patch up a reconciliation among the nobility who ruled the kingdom, and to do this it was necessary to condone two murders. Morton, Huntley, Argyle, and Sir James Balfour were all concerned in the murder of Darnley, while the assassination of the late Regent, Lennox, had been performed by the Hamiltons. Nothing was to be said, and nothing was to be done on either subject. *Judex damnatur cum nocens absolvitur.* An oligarchy ruled the unfortunate country, and the only people executed for the murder of Darnley were men of com-

paratively low degree, who could be made scapegoats. The whole tenor of the history of these disturbed times points to the fact that neither the Sovereign nor the people ruled the country. The feudal nobility were its tyrants, and to their hatred of the Church and desire of plunder we owe the Reformation. To show clearly that neither justice nor honour animated the Gospel Government, we find that Morton assembled a Parliament, which besides confirming the league with England restored the murderers, Huntley and Sir James Balfour, to their estates and honours. Shortly afterwards, as leader of the new religion, he represented to Elizabeth the necessity of entering into a mutual league for the maintenance of the Protestant religion against the Council of Trent.* He also invited the English Queen to renew the negotiations for putting Mary to death.†

The Presbyterian clergy, who had succeeded in getting a small portion of Catholic church plunder, had now to give this up to Morton, whose avarice was on a par with his brutality. The Regent then appointed two, three, or even four churches to one Minister, who was bound to preach in them by turns, and of course himself retained all overplus of revenue. Artisans, merchants, and burgesses of Edinburgh, had to pay heavy penalties to Morton on the pretended ground of rebellion, and a band of informers went about the country seeking for

* Tytler VI., p. 215

| † Tytler very justly calls this “a nefarious negotiation.”

prosecutions which might result in fines, the amount of which found their way into the coffers of the Regent. The murder of Mary in Scotland did not take place simply because Morton's terms were considered too high. "Mary owed her life to the parsimony of Elizabeth, and the avarice of the Scottish Regent." *

The Ministers were now becoming a power in the country, and their detestation of Morton was in proportion to the avarice with which he refused to share with them the plunder of the Church. He had besides given great offence to many burgesses in Edinburgh, because of the cruelty of his exactions, for non-payment of which several of their most opulent members had been imprisoned. Perhaps, however, the act which of all others proved most injurious to the Regent's power, was his support of Episcopacy, not, of course, because of his belief in its efficacy, but because he was enabled by the appointment of nominal bishops and abbots to retain the Church lands, which their Catholic predecessors in office had held.†

These so-called dignitaries were not inaptly styled "Tulchan," as that was the name given by farmers to a stuffed calf's skin, set up before a cow to make her give milk more willingly. At this crisis the Ministers obtained a fanatical daring leader in Andrew Melvin, who, with an enthusiast named

* Tytler, Vol. VI., p. 226. MS. letter, State Paper Office, the Regent to Leicester, August 16, 1574, Aberdeen.

† The primacy of St. Andrew's belonged to Morton himself.

Durie, constantly anathematised the office of bishop as inconsistent with the word of God. A coalition of the nobles was formed against Morton, and he was forced to resign the Regency. Subsequently he again obtained possession of the King's person, but his enemies again became too powerful for him. Jealousy and personal hatred animated a strong party of the nobles to vigorous efforts, which were at last crowned with success by the capture and imprisonment of Morton. So long as he had played into the hands of the Ministers they said nothing about the patent fact of his complicity in Darnley's murder, but now as he was a friend of Episcopacy, and had been greedy in the division of plunder, he was, with the hypocrisy of the time, formally accused of a crime which had been previously condoned. He died as he had lived, a Reformer and a professor of Protestantism. Although he was one of the most unscrupulous villains even of this unscrupulous period,* he died in what seems a blind and impenitent state, duly waited upon by Ministers of the new religion, and in full expectation of the immediate glory of heaven. Tytler, very naturally, says that it is difficult for any one who is acquainted with the dark and horrid crimes which stained the name of Morton, not to be painfully struck with the disproportion between his ex-

* He admitted his complicity in the murder of Darnley, and had previously been one of the accomplices in the murder of Rizzio. There is great reason to believe that he poisoned the Chancellor Athole.—See Tytler, Vol. VI., p. 259.

pressions of contrition and his certain anticipations of immediate glory and felicity. The compunction for his many crimes—murder, tyranny, avarice, cruelty, and lust—is so slight that we feel perplexed as to the sincerity of a repentance which seems to sit so easily. He left this life very much in the manner of John Knox, searching the Scriptures and secure of glory. He specially declared that he died in the profession of the Gospel, as it was that day taught and established in Scotland. His last words, were “Lord Jesus receive my spirit.”

It is satisfactory to know that the serious errors of Mary, as a Sovereign, which caused her ruin were entirely abandoned sometime after she became a prisoner in England. We find from letters of the Scottish Queen written in 1578, the purport of which she directed to be communicated to the Pope, that she zealously concurred with His Holiness in his project for the restitution of the true faith to Britain, and as a means to this end was thoroughly in favour of the proposed efforts of the great Catholic powers. Nothing then indeed could be more plain than that she had ruined herself, not merely by tolerating Protestantism, but by absolutely allying herself with the party of plunder and reformation among the nobles of Scotland, whose object was the persecution and destruction of the Catholic faith.

The lawful authority of her Government was so indissolubly united with the lawful authority of the Church, that when the latter fell, it was as if the

foundation of a building had been removed ; the superstructure of course followed.

Her infamous natural brother (Moray) had been her chief and most trusted councillor, and it was he and the noble band of murderers and robbers who formed the party of the Reformation, to whose advice she had weakly listened, and through whose efforts she became a miserable fugitive, and the prisoner of the hereditary enemy of Scotland's liberties and Scotland's monarchs. God chastens those whom he loves, and attention to the history of Mary's imprisonment and death cannot but convince the impartial student that her sufferings and death were borne with such fortitude and conformity to the will of God as to entitle her to respect and admiration. In the furnace of adversity her errors were consumed, and she came forth refined as pure gold, and worthy to die for the noblest possible cause—the Church of God. Her letters breathe a spirit of religion and patience. For example, writing to her banished servants in 1571, she says, “My faithful and good servants, seeing that it has pleased God to visit me with so much affliction, and now with this strict imprisonment and the banishment of you, my servants, from me ; I return thanks to the same God who has given me strength and patience to endure it, and pray that this good God may give you like grace. And now at my departure I charge each one of you, in the name of God, and for my blessing, that you be good servants to God, and do not murmur against Him for any affliction

which may befall you, for thus it is His custom to visit His chosen. I commend to you the Faith in which you have been baptised and instructed along with me, remembering that out of the Ark of Noah there is no salvation, and like as you make profession of no other Sovereign than myself alone, so I pray you to profess with me, one God, one Faith, one Catholic Church. . . . Therefore I pray to God, with an anguished and afflicted heart, that according to His infinite mercy He may be the protector of my country and my faithful subjects; and that He may forgive those who have done me so much injury, and are so hostile to me, and turn their hearts to a speedy repentance, and that He may give you all grace, and me also, to conform us to His will.”*

The case of the guilt or innocence of Mary Stuart, so far as the murder of Darnley is concerned, rests to a great extent upon the celebrated “casket letters.” It is stated that when, on the 7th June, 1567, the Queen and Bothwell hurriedly left Edinburgh, the latter left behind, in the custody of Sir James Balfour, a casket of about a foot in length, gilt and enamelled, containing valuable papers. If it be proved, as it undoubtedly has been, that the incriminating epistles said to have been written by Mary are clumsy forgeries, then one of the basest and most treacherous acts was committed.

* *Letters of Mary Stuart, Queen of Scotland, selected from Recueil. MS. lettres de Marie Stuart*, by Prince Alexander Habanoff, p. 223.

by the leaders of the Reformation. That they were capable of this conduct the tenor of their lives sufficiently shows. It is absurd to imagine that Church plunderers and murderers were not capable of forgery, in fact the subtle ingenuity as well as lawless boldness of these men is traceable throughout the history of the country and the times they disgraced. For the purpose of compromising the Earl of Sunderland, a forged correspondence was placed in the pockets of Lord Huntley, who was slain at the battle of Corrichie, in 1562. A forged correspondence of the Earl of Lennox was produced by Elizabeth's Ambassador in Scotland (Randolph) in 1581. Not only was Mary's own signature forged to the warrant for the Earl of Huntley's execution, but a pretended letter from her to Bothwell (June 15th, 1567) was shown to her by Kirkaldy of Grange, and by her most indignantly repudiated.*

These casket letters come to us directly and exclusively from the unscrupulous and deadly enemies of the Queen, and there is no independent confirmatory testimony with regard to their discovery and seizure. As we have seen, Mary urgently asked for the inspection of these documents when they were put in evidence before Elizabeth, but she was not permitted to see them, and the Queen of

* Mary herself declared that there were many, "both men and women," who were able to counterfeit her writing. Whitaker proves several instances of palpable forgery committed by Maitland, who figures prominently in the history of the Darnley murder and its sequel.

England decided in favour of her innocence. Of the letters themselves the two first purport to have been sent from Glasgow, and in them is indicated the respective messengers by whom they were sent to Bothwell. The first is despatched by Betoun, "who goes one day of law to the Lord of Balfours." This man was well known, and was in the power of the Confederate Lords during the very time of their procedure against Mary, besides his evidence would have put to silence the protest of the Queen's friends as to her non-receipt of this letter. *But he was never called as a witness.* The second letter is alleged to have been carried by a French servant, named Hubert, or Paris, but although this man was in the power of Moray subsequent to 1568, no attempt whatever was made to obtain his evidence until the other side loudly called for it, and then *under torture* he was said to have been made to utter a farrago of nonsense called a confession, certified only by a creature of the Regent, and in contradiction of which Paris, when on the scaffold, declared the entire innocence of the Queen. Three of the letters of the casket were genuine letters of Mary addressed to Darnley in the opening days of their married life. The forgery here consists in their being represented to be addressed to Bothwell. There is nothing whatever in them which a wife could not with propriety address to her husband. Mr. Froude, the panegyrist of Henry VIII., is also the defamer of Ireland and of Mary Queen of Scots. As this writer recklessly uses falsehoods in support

of his contentions, very little weight can be given to his conclusious. For instance, this *historian* does not hesitate without any warrant in the text, to assert that "the casket letters were long, and minutely examined by each and every one of the Lords who were present." Cecil's account, however, clearly shows that the examination was quite the contrary. His exact words are, "It is to be noted that at the time of the producing, and hearing, and reading of all the said letters, there was no special choice of or regard had to the order of the producing thereof; but the whole writings, lying altogether upon the council table, the same were one after another shown rather by hap as the same did lie upon the table than with any choice made as by the nature thereof, *as, if time had so served, might have been.*" This is the "long and minute" examination of Mr. Froude.*

Only another instance out of many. Mr. Froude accepts the casket letters "because "their contents were confirmed in every particular unfavourable to the Queen by a Catholic informant of the Spanish Ambassador." The whole authority for this most sweeping assertion is *one short and vague sentence, which does not contain a single distinct fact, incident, conversation, or allusion.* The informant of the Ambassador never alludes to the casket letters, for the excellent reason that the casket was not discovered for nearly six months after his interview! With amazing audacity, Mr. Froude actually

* De Silva's Despatch. Quoted by Froude, Vol. IX., p. 18.

prints the Spanish words used: "Aunque no la condeño de palabra, no la salbó nada,"* which words simply declare that the Ambassador *declined to offer any opinion*. He neither condemned nor acquitted her. Every impartial student admits that the casket letters must unquestionably be condemned as forgeries.†

The life of Mary Queen of Scots, from the time she crossed the border to throw herself upon the generosity of the English Queen until the day when she died on the scaffold by order of Elizabeth, was one long course of suffering. With horrible injustice, every plot and scheme against Elizabeth was made a scourge for the unfortunate

* A straw shows the direction of the current. The writer of this *History of the Reformation* has lived many years in South Africa, and was there when Mr. Froude visited the Orange Free State. Subsequently Mr. Froude made public certain statements which Mr. Reitz, Chief Justice of the Free State, replied to in the "Orange Free State Magazine," published at Bloemfontein. In this reply, Mr. Reitz points out a misstatement by Mr. Froude, which he terms, not a mistake, but a downright falsehood. Mr. Reitz proves what he says perfectly.

† On the subject of Mary Queen of Scots and the casket papers, see *Mary Queen of Scots and her Accusers*, by John Hosack, barrister-at-law, in which her innocence is clearly proved in a very able and temperate manner; *Mary Stuart, Her Guilt or Innocence: An Inquiry into the Secret History of Her Time*, by Alex. McNeal, laird; *Marie Stuart et ses derniers Historiens*, par L. Wiesener; Miss Strickland's *Life of Mary Queen of Scots*; and specially valuable and able articles in the *Dublin Review*, Vol. XXXII.

captive, who had to suffer, not merely imprisonment, but all the various indignities which petty tyranny and narrow intolerance could invent. The heaviest link in all the long chain of Mary's sorrows was the unfortunate position of her son as a heretic and abettor of heresy. Her mother's heart pleaded for him in order to his reception and instruction in the Catholic Faith, "which is the thing in the world I most desire, affecting a great deal rather the salvation of his soul than to see him monarch of all Europe. . . . there shall remain in my heart a thousand regrets and apprehensions if I should die to leave behind me a tyrant and persecutor of the Catholic Church." As the hart thirsts after the fountains of water, so did Elizabeth and her ministers seek pretexts for the execution of Mary. As an independent princess, over whom the Queen of England possessed no jurisdiction, she had a perfect right to seek her freedom, and to effect it by the intervention, if possible, of foreign powers. The plot of Babington was known from the first—if, indeed, it were not abetted—by the English ministers, and traps were laid for Mary to fall into. But as Nan, one of Mary's secretaries, declared, the Queen had neither invented nor desired, nor in any way meddled with the plot, but had confined herself to the designs for the invasion of the realm and her escape. It is possible that in Babington's last

letter reference was made to the assassination of Elizabeth, but of this Mary in no way approved, and attested the fact on the scaffold. It was found necessary to wring out forced statements on the rack in order to find some colour for the mockery of a trial to which an independent sovereign, unlawfully held in captivity for nineteen years, had to be subjected, and so glaring was the injustice and cruelty of putting Mary to death that Elizabeth, with detestable hypocrisy, had to pretend that she had not been executed with her consent, a dissimulation accompanied by the additional injustice of putting one of her officers in the Tower for merely carrying out her orders. Such a woman was capable of anything.* Mary received the news of her intended trial with dignity and fortitude. "I cannot but be sorry," she said, "that my sister is so ill-informed against me as to have treated every offer made by myself or my friends with neglect. I am Her Highness's nearest kinswoman, and have forewarned her of coming dangers, but have not been believed. . . . It was easy to be foreseen that every danger which

* It is strikingly significant of the character of the Reformation—"a tree is known by its fruit"—that in the preface to the authorised version of the Scriptures, Elizabeth is styled "that bright, occidental star"; and the contemptible James, who allowed his mother to be put to death, and took a pension from the hand that slew her, is also fulsomely bespattered with flattery and praise. Elizabeth, James I., John Knox, and Moray, Henry VIII. and Cranmer—these are thy gods, O Israel!

might arise to my sister, from foreign princes or private persons, or for matter of religion, would be laid to my charge. I know I have many enemies about the Queen. Witness my long captivity, the studied indignities I have received, and now this last association between my sister and my son, in which I was not consulted, and which has been concluded without my consent. . . . Worn down as I may appear, my heart is great, and will not yield to any affliction. I am ignorant of the laws and statutes of this realm ; I am destitute of counsel ; I know not who can be my competent peers ; my papers have been taken from me ; and nobody dareth or will speak on my behalf, though I am innocent. I have not procured or encouraged any hurt against your mistress. Let her convict me by my words, or by my writings. Sure I am neither the one nor the other can be produced against me, albeit I am free to confess that when my sister had rejected every offer which I made I remitted myself and my cause to foreign princes."

The cruel farce of a trial took place in the hall of Fotheringay Castle, on the 14th October, 1586, when the Lord High Chancellor, the Lord Treasurer, and thirty-four commissioners, comprising peers and knights of the Privy Council, the chief justices of England, the barons of the Exchequer, the Attorney-General, Solicitor-General, and Serjeant-at-Law were all drawn up in dread array against the captive Queen. "Alas!" said she,

“here are many counsellors but not one for me.” Under protest she pleaded that, as a free Princess, she was not amenable to this tribunal. With surprising ability, Mary confounded the judges, and if the court had not been packed and the conclusion foregone, must have won her case. She showed that all the evidence produced against her was second-hand or hearsay. Copies of a long letter from a man whom she had never seen, and a detailed reply which she had never written, were produced. Garbled and manufactured evidence were, however, considered quite sufficient for the purpose. In vain did Mary demand originals. These were never produced. If this had been done she would have been able to detect and unmask the fraud. “I do not deny that I have longed for liberty, and earnestly laboured to procure it. Nature impelled me to do so, but I call God to witness that I never conspired the death of the Queen of England or consented to it. I confess that I have written to my friends and solicited their assistance in my escape from her miserable prisons, in which she has now kept me a captive Queen for nineteen years, but I never wrote the letters now produced against me. I confess, too, that I have written often, too, in favour of the persecuted Catholics; and had I been able, or even at this moment were I able to save them from their miseries by shedding my own blood, I would have done it, and would now do it.”* At last the

* Tytler (Vol. VII., p. 81) justly observes, “It would be

hypocritical travestie of justice closed. Mary was ordered to prepare for death, and although the spiritual consolations of a priest were at first allowed, they were afterwards peremptorily withdrawn, and the ministrations of a Protestant divine were promised. Her goaler (Paulet), knowing the vindictive hatred of his mistress (Elizabeth), endeavoured to curry favour by insolence and mean tyranny towards his unfortunate prisoner. On one occasion he entered her room without ceremony, and stated that as she was now no longer to be considered a queen, but a private woman, dead in law, the insignia of royalty must be dispensed with. Mary replied with spirit that she as little acknowledged his queen for her superior as she did her heretical council for her judges, and in spite of the indignities they offered, would die, as she had lived, a queen. Paulet sat down in her presence with his hat on, and brutally ordered the unjust to call that a trial where the prisoner was deprived of counsel, not permitted access to her papers, and debarred from calling witnesses." In speaking of the facility with which her cyphers and letters could be counterfeited, Mary said, " What security have I that these are my very cyphers ? A young man lately in France has been detected forging my characters. Think you Mr. Secretary (Walsingham) that I am ignorant of your devices, used so craftily against me ? Your spies surrounded me on every side ; but you know not that some of your spies on me proved false, and brought intelligence to me. And if such has been his doings, my lords, how can I be assured that he hath not counterfeited my cyphers to bring me to my death ? Has he not already practised against my life, and that of my son ? "

billiard-table to be removed, as vain recreations no longer became a person in her situation.*

The malignity and intolerance of Presbyterianism was displayed in its true colours when Mary, having suffered nineteen years captivity, and at the mercy of her enemies, was about to suffer death. Her son, the King of Scotland, begged the ministers to pray for her, but these cruel and relentless pharisees peremptorily refused. To such lengths did they go that one of them, named Cowper, intruded himself into the pulpit of the high church, and when James told him that he might remain there if he would pray for his mother, received an insolent refusal, garnished with the usual blasphemy of his sect. The Royal Guard had to pull down the intruder, and he descended denouncing curses against all those who opposed him. Archbishop Adamson, who belonged to the detested episcopal faction, then preached a sermon, in which he made a good deal

* Tytler says that "such brutal and insolent conduct would have disgraced the commonest jailor in the kingdom." At this time the contemptible James (Mary's son) made no effort worthy of the name in favour of his mother. Talking of this, "he replied that his mother was in no danger; she must be content to drink the ale she had brewed. . . . Her practises had nearly cost him his crown, and" (here comes his professional "cant) "he could be well content she would meddle with nothing but prayer and serving of God." To their honour, however, be it said, many of the nobles of Scotland resented Elizabeth's insolence, and were ready to join in any league against her.

of capital for his party by laying considerable stress upon the Christian duty of praying for all men, and so pathetically did he beg God's mercy for the Queen as to leave the congregation in tears, "lamenting the obstinacy of their pastors." Elizabeth now made a strenuous effort to secure the private assassination of Mary. Complaining of Goaler Paulet and others, she said to Secretary Davison, "Even now it might be so done that the blame might be removed from myself. Would you and Walsingham write jointly and sound Sir Amias and Sir Drew Drury upon it."* A letter was accordingly sent to the former, recommending the secret assassination of his royal charge, but Mary's goaler drew the line at secret murder, particularly as under such a hypocritical and uncertain mistress as Elizabeth, who would, as the context proves in the case of Davison † have thought nothing of committing him to the Tower after he had carried out her commands. Nothing more remained but public execution, and for this Elizabeth duly signed the warrant.

On Tuesday the 7th of February, 1586-7, the Earls of Shrewsbury and Kent entered the apartment of Mary at Fotheringay Castle, where they found her seated as usual at the foot of her bed with her work-table before her. Beale then read the commission, at the conclusion of which Mary

* Spottiswood, p. 334.

† *Davison's Defence*, drawn up by himself in *Caligula*, Vol. CIX., fo. 470. Quoted by Tytler, Vol. VII., p. 105.

made the Sign of the Cross, and thanked her gracious God that this welcome news had at last come. She assured those present that she looked upon her fate as a signal happiness after so many evils and sorrows endured for His Holy Catholic Church. "That Church for which I have been ready, as I have so often testified, to lay down my life and to shed my blood drop by drop. Alas! I did not think myself worthy of so happy a death as this; but I acknowledge it as a sign of the love of God, and humbly receive it as an earnest of my reception into the number of his servants." Having entreated to have the services of a Catholic priest, this was peremptorily and brutally refused. She spent the night in prayer, and it was noticed that a look of animated joy passed over her features as if she had just heard good news. "Did you remark, Burgoine," she said to her physician, "what that Earl of Kent said in his talk with me, that my life would have been the death, as my death would be the life, of their religion? Oh, how glad am I at that speech! Here comes the truth at last, and I pray you remark it. They told me I was to die because I plotted against the Queen; but then arrives this Kent, whom they sent hither to convict me. And what says he? 'That I am to die for my religion.'"^{*}

The summons to come forth to die was answered

* Camden in *Kennet*, Vol. II., p. 534. "Mort de la Reine d'Ecosse." *Jebo*, Vol. II., p. 625.

cheerfully by Queen Mary, who desired the Crucifix to be borne before her.

Sir Andrew Melvil, one of her old servants, kneeling and shedding tears, exclaimed: "Ah, madam; unhappy me! What man on earth was ever before the messenger of so important sorrow and heaviness as I shall be when I shall report that my good and gracious Queen and mistress is beheaded in England?" Whereupon Mary, "pouring forth her dying tears," answered, "My good servant, cease to lament, for thou hast cause rather to joy than to mourn, for now shalt thou see Mary Stuart's troubles receive their long expected end and determination. For know, good servant, all the world is but vanity, and subject still to more sorrow than a whole ocean of tears can bewail. But I pray thee carry this message from me, That I die a true woman to my religion and like a true Queen of Scotland and of France. But God forgive them that have long desired my end and thirsted for my blood as the hart doth for the water brooks."

Having prayed the lords to allow her female servants to be close to her at death, the Earl of Kent ungraciously refused; but after consultation, and her renewed entreaty, six men and women servants were allowed to attend her. Then, without the slightest sign of fear, and with all the intrepidity of her nation and of her ancestors, she stepped up to the scaffold and sat down. During the reading of the commission for her execution,

Mary listened attentively with a serene and cheerful countenance. Then Dr. Fletcher, Protestant Dean of Peterborough, persistently addressed her, to whom she said : "Mr. Dean, trouble not yourself nor me, for know that I am settled in the ancient Catholic and Roman religion, and in defence thereof, by God's grace, I mind to spend my blood."

Mr. Dean : Madam, change your opinion, and repent you of your former wickedness. Settle your faith only upon this ground, that in Christ Jesus you hope to be saved.

The Queen : Good Mr. Dean, trouble not yourself any more about this matter, for I was born in this religion, have lived in this religion, and am resolved to die in this religion.

The Earls : Madam, we will pray for your Grace with Mr. Dean, that you may have your mind lightened with the true knowledge of God and His Word.

The Queen : My lords, if you will pray with me I will, even from my heart, thank you, and think myself greatly favoured by you; but to join in prayer with you in your manner, who are not of one religion with me, it were a sin, and I will not.

The Dean then persistently prayed, but the Queen, not regarding him, attended to her own devotions. Then she rose, and again kneeling down prayed in English for Christ's afflicted Church, for her son, and for the Queen's Majesty (Elizabeth). She forgave her enemies from her heart that long sought her blood. This done, she

begged the intercession of the saints, and, kissing the Crucifix, blessed herself, and said aloud, “Even as Thy arms, oh, Jesus Christ ! were spread here upon the Cross, so receive me into the arms of mercy.” She made herself ready for the block with “a kind of gladness,” laid her head upon it, and called aloud, *“In te Domine confido; in manus tuas Domine, commendo spiritum meum.”* With two strokes of the axe her head was severed from the body.

Then said Mr. Dean, “So perish all the Queen’s enemies ;”* The goodness and mercy of God permitted Mary to die a martyr for the Catholic Faith, and in this glorious manner she ended, with infinite honour, a life of trial, adversity and sorrow. The unwisdom and follies of the early part of her reign as Queen of Scotland were expiated by her long imprisonment and cruel death in England.

Elizabeth called God to witness, with the most solemn and awful asseverations, that her determined resolution had been all along to save the life of Mary. She had herself signed the warrant for the execution of the Queen of Scots, had commanded it to be carried to the Seals, and had forbidden Secretary Davison to communicate with her further on the subject until the deed was done.†

* For full particulars of the execution of Mary, see *Narrative of the Execution of the Queen of Scots, in a Letter to the Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Cecil; Letters of Mary Queen of Scots*, edited by Agnes Strickland, Vol. II., p. 253.

† “She had declared to Sir Robert Melvil that she would

Now “this upright and able, but most unfortunate of men,” was tried before the Star Chamber, degraded from his office of secretary, ruined by the infliction of a most severe fine, and never afterwards admitted to the least enjoyment of favour. Elizabeth’s gross falsehood and perfidy had, of course, no effect in Europe. The news of Mary’s death was received in Scotland with a burst of execrations and threats of revenge. But the icy fingers of the Reformation were round the throat of the unfortunate country, and in its strangled and helpless condition nothing could be done against the real head of the Reformation and ruler of Scotland—Elizabeth. The Ministers were secretly delighted, while Mary’s contemptible son, although he at first “swore that so foul an act of tyranny and injustice should not pass unrevenged,” soon allowed his own narrow selfishness to stifle every honourable and manly feeling. The enemies of the Catholic Religion had triumphed; but, as the blood of the martyrs is the seed of saints, so does the blood of Mary, shed in defence of justice and religion, cry aloud against the false doctrines, pernicious calumnies, and vile actions of the leaders of the Reformation.

not spare his royal mistress’s life for an hour; now she swore vehemently that she never intended to take it. She had assured Davison, with a great oath, that she meant the execution to go forward. She had laboured assiduously with Paulet to have Mary secretly done away with.” Her subsequent conduct consequently proved her desire and explicit command.—See Tytler, Vol. VII., p. 122-3.

CHAPTER IX.

Melancholy effects of the Reformation.—No liberty.—The Arts and Education neglected.—No progress.—Harsh and intolerant laws.—Persecution of Witches and of Papists.—Cruelty of the Ministers.—Presbyterians versus Episcopalian.—Persecution of Catholics.—Dreadful state of the Country.—Vice and immorality prevalent.—The Catholic proto-martyr.—The Archbishop of S. Andrews.—Mary and John Ogilvie.—Jesuit priests and Catholic martyrs.—Execution of Ogilvie.—The Kirk essentially persecuting.—An enemy to progress both mental and material.—Catholic Missionaries.—Life of Father Archangel.—Inveterate and persistent persecution.—A literature of the dark ages of Presbyterian persecution wanted.—Phœnix-like the Scottish Hierarchy rises from its ashes.

THE Reformation in Scotland was conceived in the iniquity of the nobility, who desired to gratify their own avarice as well as their bitter detestation of the clergy. Its first agents and abettors were wicked, self-seeking men, and no hypocrisy could have been greater than the pretence that

their struggle was for toleration and for liberty of opinion in matters of faith. In truth, they allowed no one to think differently from themselves ; even Protestant episcopacy was banned ; and one of the most cruel and narrow tyrannies erected in the room of the Catholic Church. The Bible could not be, and practically was not, in the hands of the people.* Bigotry of an intense nature characterised Presbyterianism, and as soon as the power of the Ministers was established, they interfered in the most arbitrary manner with even the domestic concerns of the people.† Witches, as

* Chambers, in his *Annals*, furnishes us with curious information about the ridiculously slow progress of the first translation, each copy of which cost more than four pounds.

† Cockburn's *Life of Jeffrey*, 1852, Vol. I., p. 74. In *The Memoirs of Locheil* we read : " Every parish had a tyrant, who made the greatest lord in his district stoop to his authority. The Kirk was the place where he kept his court ; the pulpit his throne or tribunal, from whence he issued out his terrible decrees ; and twelve or fourteen sour, ignorant enthusiasts, under the title of elders, composed his council. If any, of what quality soever, had the assurance to disobey his orders, the dreadful sentence of excommunication was immediately thundered out against him, his goods and chattels confiscated and seized, and he himself being looked upon as actually in the possession of the devil and irretrievably doomed to eternal perdition." Spies were employed to find out domestic faults and report them—Wodrow's *Collections*, Vol. II., Pt. II., p. 74. The Presbytery of Aberdeen, " by an unparalleled barbarity," forced Sir Alex Irvine's servants to reveal upon oath what they saw, heard, or knew done in his house—*The Miscellany of the Spalding Club*, Vol. III., p. 206.

well as Papists, were diligently hunted down and persecuted. Ignorance and superstition prevailed, and the laws were administered in accordance with the views of the intolerant sect which, by degrees, grasped all real authority in the country. Presbyterianism was a curse to Scotland, and it is worse than nonsense to speak about its giving liberty, freedom of thought, or progress. Exactly the contrary was the case. It was absolutely not until the nineteenth century that the trammels of this hideous usurpation were partially thrown off. Lord Cockburn tells us that, so late as the year 1794, "there was then no popular representation, no emancipated burghs, no effective rival of the Established Church, no independent press, no free public meetings, and no better trial by jury, even in the political cases (except high treason), than what was consistent with the circumstances; that the jurors were not sent into court under any impartial rule, and that when in court those who were to try the case were named by the presiding judge. The Scotch representatives were only forty-five, of whom thirty were elected for counties, and fifteen for towns. Both from its price and its nature (being enveloped in feudal and technical absurdities) the elective franchise in counties where alone it existed, was far above the reach of the whole lower class, and of a great majority of the middle, and of many even of the higher rank. There were probably not above 1,500 or 2,000 county electors in all Scotland—a

body not too large to be held in Government hands. The return, therefore, of a single opposition member was never to be expected. . . . Of the fifteen town members, Edinburgh returned one. The other fourteen were produced by clusters of four or five unconnected burghs, electing each one delegate, and these four or five delegates electing the representative. Whatever this system may have been originally, it had grown, in reference to the people, into as complete a mockery as if it had been invented for their degradation. The people had nothing to do with it. It was all managed by town councils of never more than thirty-three members, and every town council was self-elected, and, consequently, perpetuated its own interests. The election of either the town or the county member was a matter of such utter indifference to the people that they often only knew of it by the ringing of a bell. . . . the farce was generally performed in an apartment from which, if convenient, the public could be excluded."

This is a true picture of the state of the country after more than two centuries of Presbyterian tyranny, and shows what nonsense it is to talk of the Reformation having introduced liberty and caused progress. As to science and the arts—architecture was positively proscribed, and barn-like structures took the place of the noble buildings of our Catholic ancestors. Presbyterianism was opposed to music, painting and poetry; education was really not encouraged, and anything that

can be boasted of in connexion with literature, enlarged views, or progress, was effected, not under the auspices of the reformed religion, but distinctly and completely in spite of it. Thanks be to God this incubus has, to a great extent, been removed, but it is extraordinary to what a degree it still bestrides the country. As an eloquent and learned writer remarks, "Strange and unequal combination! A people in many respects very advanced, and holding upon political questions advanced views, do upon all religious subjects display a littleness of mind, an illiberality of sentiment, a heat of temper, and a love of persecuting others, which shows that the Protestantism of which they boast has done them no good, and that it has been unable to free them from prejudices which make them the laughing-stock of Europe, and which have turned the very name of the Scotch Kirk into a byword and a reproach among educated men."*

The Presbyterian Ministers, neglected by the nobles and disendowed by the State, naturally turned to the lower orders for support, and by affecting Puritanism, and working upon the fears of the ignorant, erected an ecclesiastical tyranny under which true religion was replaced by Phariseeism, dogmatic assumption, and a system of

* Buckle's *History of Civilisation in England*, Vol. III., p. 185. For proof of the intensely persecuting spirit and relentless narrow tyranny of the Scotch Kirk, see the footnotes in Buckle's *Civilisation*, Vol. III., pp. 108-112, comprising excerpts from their own records and authorities.

relentless hatred and persecution directed against those who dared to disobey the orders of the Kirk. Sedition was always countenanced, and, indeed, generally preached, while a detestation of monarchical government was exhibited whenever the Ministers dared. Nothing more enraged them than being balked in obtaining a share of Church plunder, and this, indeed, may be looked upon as the *fons et origo* of their opposition to the nobles by whom, under whose orders, and for whose pecuniary benefit, the Reformation had been originally effected. The institution of Bishops by no means harmonised with the democratic spirit which had sprung up, and although in the first Book of Discipline, (1560), a regular ascending hierarchy was approved of, in the second Book of Discipline, (1578), this was entirely swept away, and it was specially declared that all preachers were fellow labourers and equal in power. It is not our province, nor our intention to enter into the subject of the bitter contest which existed so long in Scotland between two heresies. Murder, calumny and violence were freely used by the Calvinists; while the Episcopalians are charged with cruelty, injustice, and other crimes. Presbyterianism eventually conquered. Each of these sects was entirely false to its pretended principles of toleration and liberty of opinion in matters of faith, and while contending against each other never failed to join in the persecution and proscription of the Catholic Church.

To show really what the Reformation in Scotland was, it is necessary not only to regard the character and actions of its principal leaders, and their motives for action, but also to look down the stream of history at its effects.

We see the liberal arts not only neglected, but despised. No liberty nor progress, but, on the contrary, the narrowest intolerance, the grossest superstition, and the most searching and thorough persecution.

So early as May, 1569, we are told that the Regent (Moray) made progress to Stirling, where four priests of Dunblane were condemned to death for saying Mass; "but he remitted their lives, and caused them to be bound to the Mercat Cross with their vestments and chalices in derision, when the people cast eggs and other villanie at their faces for the space of an hour."* This was the early part of the passion of the Catholic Church in Scotland. The enlightened Reformers were at this time also busily engaged in witch hunting, as the *Diurnal of Occurrents* (1569) informs us that, "In my Lord Regent's passing to the north, he caused burn certain witches in Saint Andrews,

* *Domestic Annals of Scotland*. Chambers. Vol. I., pp. 59-60. This author extracts from a large number of authentic sources:—*The Historie of King James the Sixt*; *The Diurnal of Occurrences*; *History of the Kirk of Scotland*, by Calderwood; Pitcairn's *Criminal Trials*; Knox's *History of the Reformation*; *Council Records*; Spottiswood, Spalding, etc., etc., in a Protestant point of view unexceptionable authorities.

and returning he caused burn another company of witches in Dundee." The Kirk ostentatiously opposed the subordination of architecture, music, painting and sculpture to the praise, glory and worship of God. All the liberal arts were neglected, and in *The Lamentations of Scotland* the churches are thus described :—

The rooms appointed for people to consider
 To hear God's word where they should pray together
 Are now converted in sheep cots and folds
 Or else are fallen, because none them upholds.
 The parish Kirks I ween they sae misguide
 That none for wind and rain therein may bide,
 But feathers, filth and dung does lie abroad.
 Where folk should sit to hear the Word of God.

So very popular was the persecution of Papists, that we find (1574) that a man, nicknamed Doctor Hendre, was forgiven the crime of adultery on account of his great exertions against Catholicism. But again being found guilty of the same offence, he was leniently punished by being placed in the stocks, where, in a great fury, he took his own knife and stabbed himself to the heart.*

We are told that, in 1575, after the Reformed religion had been thoroughly established, no edition of the Scriptures had as yet been published in Scotland. An order was given to print one, but years elapsed before it was finished, and each parish had to advance £5 as a contribution, of which £4 13s. 4d. was taken to be the price of

* *Chamber's*, Vol. I., pp. 92-3.

one copy ; 6s. 8d. was charged as commission. What absurdity to talk under these circumstances of the dissemination of the Scriptures among the people, or about the personal knowledge of the Bible by the people, having anything to do with the Reformation.

To show how justice was administered by the Reformers when one of their own party was concerned, it is only necessary to refer to "the singular collusive trial which took place on the 26th of May, 1586, for the purpose of clearing Mr. Archibald Douglas, parson, of Glasgow, of his concern in the murder of Darnley. He had been in exile or hiding since, except during the Regency of Morton, whose cousin he was. But now it was thought he might prove useful in advancing the King's prospects in England ; so with the most barefaced contempt for the very forms of justice, he was tried by a packed jury and acquitted."*

In 1586, the Reformation did not seem to have effected much good, as the General Assembly reports the moral condition of the country as awful, "ugly heaps of sin lying in all parts of it ; no spot but what was overwhelmed as by an inundation of swearing, perjury, lying, rebellion

* *Chambers*, Vol. I. p. 163. Chambers' character of King James exhibits sound judgment. He says, "He was a strange mixture of cleverness and weakness, of wit and folly. His greatest deficiency was in a courageous will to pursue the ends of justice. . . . He shrank from all strong measures except against poor and inferior people, and those who had wounded his own pettier feelings." . . .

against the magistrates and the laws, incest, adultery, sacrilege, theft, oppression, and finally with all kinds of impiety and wrong. The poor at the same time wandering in great troops through the country without either law or religion.”* This same General Assembly demanded that all Papist noblemen should be at once sent out of the country, while certain priests should be sharply despatched by first ships, with certification that on their daring to “return they should be hanged without further process.”

The Privy Council Record informs us, that in 1601, “Sundry Jesuits, seminary priests, and trafficking Papists were daily creeping within the country.” James Wood, the heir of Bonnington, in Forfarshire, was “excommunicated” simply because he was a Catholic, and afterwards, on a trumped up charge, connected with taking property from his own father’s house, was beheaded at the Cross. James would have pardoned him, but Caldewood tells us that “the Ministers were instant with the King for a proof of his sincerity,” and so the unfortunate youth had to be executed. The Ministers were invariably on the side of severity and persecution. Whether the prisoners were “Papists” or “witches” they had no mercy to expect from pharisaical ignorant teachers, who were principally guided by a liberal interpretation of a book they by no means understood—the

* *Booke of the Universall Kirk of Scotland. (Bannatyne Club.)*

Old Testament. Like the Jews in the time of Our Saviour, when they saw their victim, the Ministers never failed persistently to cry out "*Let him be crucified!*" The persecution of the Reformers extended to the invasion of the domestic privacy of their unhappy victims. In 1601 the General Assembly arranged that certain Ministers should go to the Catholic nobles, Huntley, Errol, Angus, Home and Herries, and plant themselves in their families for the purpose of making them Protestant. This gross insult and refinement of persecution was duly carried into effect. Gilbert Brown, the good Abbot of New Abbey, was arrested near Dumfries, in August, 1605, by the Earl of Cranston, "not without peril from the country people, who rose to rescue him out of his hands." One special cause of Catholic persecution was the desire of the Government to further the cause of Episcopacy by pleasing the Ministers. These men positively thirsted for the blood of Catholics, and with fiendish malignity, constantly urged upon the King the necessity of extreme measures. In 1608 the General Assembly prayed for the execution of penal laws. In order to please them, the King's commissioner had to promise that "the sword should strike without mercy or favour." In this same year (1608) we find one of the very many cases where the reformed religion caused poor old women to be most brutally burnt alive for the alleged crime of witchcraft. "The Earl of Mar declared to the Privy Council

that some women were ta'en in Broughton as witches. . . . albeit they persevered constant in their denial to the end, yet they were burnt alive after such a cruel manner that some of them died in despair, and others, half burned, broke out of the fire, and they were cast in alive again till they were burned to death."*

It would be tiresome to give details of the Catholic persecution. It was constant, searching, and unmerciful. A Dominican monk of Aberdeen, named Black, who is described by his adversaries as respectable both for piety and learning, was stoned to death in the streets of Edinburgh because he had dared to dispute with Willox and other leaders of the Reformation. Black was the Stephen or proto-martyr. Numbers of others followed.

The Archbishop of St. Andrews was, in 1571, "dragged with but little ceremony to a scaffold, and put to a dog's death." "As touching his religion," says George Buchanan, "I reasoned with him, and could find nothing but that he was a papist, and exhorted such as were near at hand upon the scaffold to abide in the Catholic Faith." As the bell rung out the hour of the *Angelus*—six o'clock—this Archbishop was hanged on a gibbet at the Market

* Earl of Haddington's *Notes*, quoted by Pitcairn Vol. III., p. 579., referred to by Chambers. In the *Domestic Annals* numerous accounts of witch persecution can be found.

Cross, at Sterling, on the 7th April, 1571.* The next great martyr who boldly trod the scaffold was Mary Queen of Scots, and she was followed by John Ogilvie, a Jesuit priest, who was hanged for being a Catholic, on the 28th of February, 1615. Ogilvie was a man of good family and excellent education, who had for three months earnestly and diligently endeavoured to offer the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, and to perform his duties diligently as a priest in Glasgow. Thirteen or fourteen other Catholics were arrested at the same time, but the avarice of the authorities permitted them to escape on the payment of heavy fines. When Ogilvie was asked why he came to Scotland, he answered, truthfully and boldly: By order of his superior to save souls. The cruel Presbyterians then tortured him by semi-starvation, and the deprivation of sleep, and succeeded in making him light-headed and delirious. The king had a sneaking desire to save him, but was too cowardly and mean to exert himself, and as Ogilvie would not in any way admit regal authority in matters of faith, he was left to the mercy of the Ministers. "In declining the King's authority, in such matters, he did no more than the best of the Presbyterian clergy did—a

* The following lines were written on the gibbet:

*Cresce diu, felix arbor, semperque vireto
Frondbibus, ut nobis talia poma feras.*

Diurnal of Remarkable Occurrences in Scotland (Maitland Club)

cause in which they would persevere if they were wise." Ogilvie declared "I have done no offence, neither will I beg mercy. If I were even now forth of the kingdom I should return. If all the hairs on my head were priests, they should all come into the kingdom." Spottiswoode, the so-called Archbishop of Glasgow, was among the most conspicuous men in the persecution of this noble Jesuit martyr; and we are told "that this hanging would, of course, have procured some popularity for the King and Bishops if it had proceeded from the right motive; but it was looked upon rather as a sop to the Ministerial Cerberus, and a bid for their extension of favour in the opinion of episcopacy."

The condemnation of Ogilvie was followed in three hours by his execution. After spending some hours in prayer this martyr proceeded to the scaffold, where he was persecuted to the last moment of his life by the impertinent importunities of the Ministers. One of these men—Master Richard Scott—took it upon himself to declare an obvious falsehood by calling aloud that his (Ogilvie's) suffering was not for any matter of religion, but for heinous treason against his Majesty. Ogilvie hearing this said, "he doeth me wrong," and a man, named John Abercrombie, standing by cried out: "No matter, John, the more wrongs the better." Having ended his prayer, the martyr went up the ladder, kissed the hangman, and called upon the Blessed Virgin Mary,

all the saints, and all the angels to intercede for him. The executioner asked him to say "Lord have mercy on me. Lord receive my soul," which he immediately humbly did, and was then launched into eternity.

The Kirk it was—Ministers and elders—that specially persecuted. The King and the Government rather trying to moderate the punishments. For instance, on the 14th August, 1615, three respectable citizens of Edinburgh named Sinclair, Wilkie, and Cruikshanks, were absolutely sentenced to death for merely entertaining the martyred Ogilvie and two other Priests. There was very great hope among the Presbyterians that these men would be hanged, but Caldewood, their own disappointed historian, tells us "The day following the trial they were brought forth to the scaffold. While a great multitude of the people were going to see the execution, there was a warrant presented to the magistrates of Edinburgh to stay the execution. So they were turned back again to their wards. *The people thought this form of dealing rather mockery than punishment.*"* The supposed spirit of the Old Testament—of vengeance, of hatred, of extermination, of virulent relentless and searching cruelty—was the spirit of Presbyterianism in Scotland. The reformed Gospel of Jesus Christ consisted in narrow intolerance, despotism, and tyranny of a most offensive character, accompanied by

* See Caldewood's *History*.

vindictive persecution. The Reformation was specially opposed to liberty—there could be none under the rule of the Ministers. It was an enemy to all the liberal arts, and in all respects a deadly foe to either mental or material progress. It was in spite of it, eventually, that Scotland lifted up her head after two centuries of strife, debauchery, and debasement. All the great progress of the present day commenced with the nineteenth century, and was as much caused by the Reformation as much as the Goodwin Sands by Tinterden steeple.

The persecution of Our Saviour caused a reconciliation between two of his judges, so did the persecution of the Catholic Church in Scotland by the Episcopalians invariably form a means of reconciliation for the time between *them* and the Presbyterians. Chambers tells us,* “Taking order with Popery was always a cheap and ready means of making political capital against Presbyterian opponents. We accordingly find the Privy Council at this date (1628) issuing orders against a number of persons of consideration in the north, as well as the priests whom they entertained.” The order regarding the priests includes a roll of honour in which we find inscribed the names of the following missionaries who had left all things to suffer persecution for teaching the truth: Fathers Steven, Ogilvie, Stitchill, Hegitts, the Capuchin Leslie, commonly called *The Archangel* (Father

* *Annals*, Vol. II., p. 20.

Archangel), Ogilvie, Leslie (commonly called the Captain), Andrew Leslie, John Leslie, Christie (commonly called the Principal of Dowie,) with the other two Christies; Brown, Tyrie, three Robertsons, Robb, Paterson, Pittendriech, Dum-breck, and Dr. William Leslie.

Let us briefly glance at the life of a missionary in Scotland: The young, rich, and accomplished Count Leslie had been trained a Calvinist, but his naturally good disposition and conduct led him to take an interest in religious inquiries, and when in Paris he became a convert to the Catholic Faith. Threats of being abandoned to the direst poverty had no effect, and young Leslie was turned upon the world destitute both of patrimony and friends. He then determined to devote himself entirely to God, and having proceeded to Rome, was enabled to enrol himself among the Capuchin Brothers of St. Francis under the name in religion of Archangel.* Eventually he was ordained a priest. Twenty years had elapsed when his mother sent her son, by a second husband, the young Baron of Forcy, with the special object of alluring Father Archangel, with a promise of the estates of Monnymusk, to renounce his religion,

*A brief memoir of Father Archangel was published in *The Scots Magazine* early this century. *Memoirs of the Scottish Catholic Missionaries* would form a most edifying, instructive and entertaining work. Let me respectfully commend the preparation of such a work to the Scottish Catholic clergy.

and return to Scotland. The two brothers met at Urbino, and the younger shortly afterwards became a Catholic, and on his return to his native land he was turned out of his mother's house in consequence. Father Archangel filled for some time the office of preacher to the French Court, but his heart yearned for the conversion of his relatives and his countrymen. He devoted himself to this great work, and, having returned to Scotland, visited his mother's house in disguise, and having eventually discovered himself, was able by his prayers and teaching to convert the entire household. Then, going forth fearlessly, he preached the truth everywhere, confuting the Calvinistic ministers in a very easy manner whenever they entered into theological disputes. With the ardent zeal of an Apostle he risked his life on innumerable occasions, frequently going so far as to meet Presbyterian congregations coming from their places of worship, and telling them plainly that what their Ministers taught was erroneous. His earnest captivating eloquence, holy life, and undaunted bravery soon produced a wonderful effect, and it is stated that no fewer than four thousand persons in Aberdeen and its neighbourhood were brought back to the bosom of the Church. He now became a special object of hatred and persecution, and so envenomed and severe became the efforts of the Ministers, that they at length succeeded in forcing him out of the realm into England. His mother was driven penniless and homeless into the

world because she dared to believe as her conscience dictated. Her asylum was a wretched hovel on the estates which were once her own, and there her son (Father Archangel), disguised as a poor farm labourer, ventured to come and visit her. Presbyterian spies so dogged his steps that he was shortly afterwards obliged to fly to the Continent; but he only went to return. Shipwrecked on the Isle of Wight, Father Archangel and a priest, who accompanied him, were saved, after having converted two English fellow-passengers. At Aberdeen the news awaited him that his mother was dead. Again and again he braved every danger to carry on his Apostolic work, and was so greatly successful as to enkindle against him such a fire of persecution as obliged him to obey a summons to appear before the King in London. He died on the frontier of Scotland, overcome by his excessive and continuous labour for that religion, in whose cause he most cheerfully gave his life. This is the sketch not of one missionary, but of all. With ardent devotion and zeal they kept up the flame of faith in the hearts of the faithful during the darkest ages. Catholicism was never extinct in Scotland. There were always the ten just men to save the country, and now, at last, Phoenix-like, the ancient Hierarchy has risen triumphant from its ashes.

The deplorable ignorance of the Presbyterian divines was not only shown in connection with

witchcraft and religious persecution. We find that, in 1629, a man named Alexander Blair was sentenced to lose his head for marrying his first wife's half-brother's daughter.* At the same time marriage with first cousins was not forbidden. Texts from the old Scripture were wrested in the most absurd and dangerous manner so as to make acts of immorality crimes of the greatest magnitude "fit to procure the wrath and displeasure of God to the whole nation." Pharisaism has always been one of the great works of Presbyterianism, and certainly has not a good effect on public morals. Whitened sepulchres mark the progress of Protestantism in Scotland. In spite of the pretended zeal for strict morality, and the vengeful punishment of unfortunate sinners, we are told both in Lamont and Nicols' *Diaries*, that "the preachers of the time only plunged the people into the extreme of excessive and unnatural vice, impurity and degradation." Nicols says: "Much falsehood and cheating were daily detected by the courts, for which there were every day hangings, scourgings, nailing of ears and boring of tongues, and as for adultery, fornication, incest, bigamy, and other uncleanness and filthiness, they did never more abound in Scotland than during this period. Under heaven there was not greater falsehood, oppression, divisions, hatred, pride, malice, and envy than was at this time, and divers and sundry years before, ever

* Chamber's *Annals*, Vol. II., p. 29.

since the subscribing of the covenant, every man seeking himself and his own ends.”*

The fierce, searching and intense persecution of Papists went on, generation after generation, with but little intermission. In 1629 we are told that it had reached such a pitch of keenness that it was not possible to maintain. Men were forced by the Kirk to pretend to conform, which was all that was necessary, and the mockery of religion was insisted upon under the most severe penalties. Priests were hunted, and, wherever captured, treated with the utmost rigour; and the extension of the right of worshipping God according to the individual conscience was as much a sham as the pretended righteousness and purity of the sect. In 1634 the Privy Council fulminated terrible penalties against the south-country Papists. A man and woman, who had dared to be married by a Catholic Priest, were immediately imprisoned in the Tolbooth. Seven women who had heard Mass, and were too honest to declare that they would conform to the Protestant religion, were committed to prison in Edinburgh, “to remain

* There were no fewer than nineteen Protestant sects, each hating the other for the love of God. The pride and cruelty of the Ministers was notorious, and is proved to demonstration by Protestant records. Gordon of Rothesay tells us that “Learning was discountenanced. Human learning was decried.” Even speaking of the eighteenth century Laing says: “In every species of improvement, and in the arts. and refinements of social life, we must, unfortunately, consider Scotland as a century behind at this period.”

upon their own expenses.” Now and then a smart search brought out “one or two cowed professors of the abhorred faith. A small clerical party, supported by a couple of bailies, went out of Aberdeen on the evening of Sunday, 16th April, 1643, with caption to take Alexr. Hervie in Groundhame for Popery, who was lying bed-fast in the gout.” Two days later a priest was seized, who was violently driven forth from the kingdom, and informed that if he came back he would be hanged.

In 1651 another northern laird, Sir Gilbert Menzies of Pitfoddels, was plundered most severely, and his wife and children turned out of doors for the dire offence of being Catholics. After giving particulars, Chambers says that “these historiettes are but examples of a large class.”

But it would be as tiresome as it is needless to give further details of that persecution of which the Reformation was the origin, and for which it was responsible. From the time of Knox to Lord George Gordon’s riots in the reign of George III., intense ignorance of the doctrines of the Church and intense intolerance prevailed. At one time women and children are the objects of the fury of the Ministers; at another time aged and infirm men—*always the Priests*. Persecution for justice sake had to be suffered for centuries from those whose lying boast it is to have introduced liberty of conscience. The rabble were thoroughly inoculated with a hatred for Popery. Catholicism

was represented in such a false and calumnious manner as really to be a mere myth or creature of the imagination. Lying has, indeed, always been the principal bulwark of Protestantism.

In 1688 all the houses and property of Catholics in Edinburgh, as well as the mansions of several noblemen, were mercilessly destroyed. The spirit of hatred continued; and, alas! so long as Presbyterianism proper exists in Scotland, must continue.* It was not until the nineteenth century that Catholics were enfranchised, and the rapid growth—Phoenix-like—of the Church of God in Scotland is a subject well worthy of our best thanks and of our warmest congratulations. The ancient Archbishoprics of St. Andrews and Glasgow again live, and the venerable Bishoprics of former days have been re-erected by the same Holy See, in communion with which Mungo and Columbkill taught, Malcolm, Margaret, and David governed, and Bruce and Wallace fought.

In connection with the revival of religion clearly indicated by the restoration of the Hierarchy, it is full time that proper attention should be paid to the history of Scotland in the dark ages of Presbyterian persecution. *All that the Catholic Church requires is the truth.* Let it be told. The biographies of the many missionaries who spent themselves for their souls, and the souls of

* The Covenanters acted with singular atrocity against the Catholics, and even the Episcopalians, while the reprisals of the latter against them were sharp and severe.

their countrymen, requires special attention. The present rough and imperfect sketch of the history of the Reformation in Scotland is submitted as a humble contribution to this literature.



el



行書九言聯

七

BR 385 W54 1883 SMC
Wilmot, Alexander
The story of the
Scottish reformation
AKE-2726 (sk)

